

THE
EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

NO. XXII.

OCTOBER, 1854.

ARTICLE I.

JUSTIN MARTYR.

By Rev. J. A. Brown, Reading, Pa.

THE second century of our era was a period of great interest and importance in the civil and religious history of the world. The apostles and immediate disciples of our Lord, had one after another disappeared from the stage of action, and the church, under the guidance of her Redeemer, was left to the care of other hands. Success was indeed no matter of doubtful experiment, as the promise of God rendered it sure, but there were questions to be solved, difficulties to encounter, trials to endure, and obstacles to surmount, which, even at the distance of seventeen centuries, fill the retrospect with exciting interest. Youthful christianity, relying on her own intrinsic excellence, was in collision with the old religion and institutions of paganism, supported by all the vast power of the mightiest empire the world ever saw.

The Roman empire was now at the zenith of its power and glory. The unhappy period of "the dark unrelenting Tiberius, the furious Caligula, the feeble Claudius, the profligate and cruel Nero, the beastly Vitellius, and the timid inhuman Domitian," was followed by the mild reign of Nerva, to whom succeeded, in turn, Trajan, Adrian, and the Antonines; names illustrious in history. Under their dominion, celebrated for general prudence and moderation, the condition of the empire

was greatly changed, and perhaps all secured that could well be expected under pagan rule. Although highly colored and too favorable, yet as affording evidence of unusual prosperity, may be cited the representation of Gibbon: "If a man were called to fix the period in the history of the world, during which the condition of the human race was most happy and prosperous, he would, without hesitation, name that which elapsed from the death of Domitian to the accession of Commodus." Whilst viewing this pleasing picture of the historian, it must excite strange feelings to reflect that the unoffending followers of "the Prince of peace" suffered during this period the most cruel persecution, and paid their lives as the price of their religion.

Christianity had rapidly extended among the nations. The heaven worked mightily, and the gospel went forth conquering and to conquer. "Tacitus bears testimony to the 'great multitude' of christians, and the sufferings they endured under the cruel Nero at Rome. His cotemporary and friend, Pliny, in his well known letter to Trajan, early in the second century—A. D. 110—and but a few years after the last of the apostles fell asleep, mentions the great prevalence of the new religion. It already embraced 'many of all ages, of every rank, and of both sexes,' reached to all places, left the heathen temples deserted, and the sacrificial victims without purchasers. An early apologist, with glowing rhetoric, thus describes the wonderful success of the gospel in winning followers to Christ: 'We are but of yesterday, and have filled all places belonging to you; your cities, islands, castles, towns, councils; your very camps, wards, companies, the palace, senate and forum: we have left you only your temples.' Such achievements by such means, is without a parallel in the records of history.

These two circumstances—on the one hand, the general diffusion of christianity, and the importance into which it had grown, and on the other, the prudence and moderation of the Roman government, yet withal, persecuting unto death the disciples of Christ for their religion—made this, in a preëminent sense, the age of *apologetics*. Under some of the preceding emperors, monsters of cruelty, christians could do little more than endure whatever torments hatred and cruelty could inflict, waiting a better period for the church, and sending up to heaven their cry, "O Lord! how long?" But now the persecution of innocent and unoffending persons, seemed strangely in contrast with the humane feelings and many excellent qualities of rulers admired for their prudence and jus-

tice. Better things were to be expected, and hence leading individuals of the christian communion were induced to write and present apologies or defences of their religion. Amongst this class of writers there is no name that holds a more prominent place, or that is more worthy of attention, than that of

JUSTIN MARTYR.

Justin was born at Flavia Neapolis, in Palestine—the ancient Shechem of the Bible, and the Nablus of modern geography. This city having greatly suffered, or being wholly destroyed, during the Roman wars, was rebuilt by the emperor Vespasian, received this new name, and was peopled by a colony of Greeks. From one of these families, most probably, was Justin descended, as he was of Greek parentage, and was trained up in their system of religion. His father's name was Priscus, and his grand-father's Bacchius. The precise year of his birth is not known, but it was about the close of the first, or the beginning of the second century. Being of a respectable family in good circumstances, due attention was given to his mental training, and Justin early manifested that ardent thirst after knowledge, for which he was in riper years distinguished. Having drank from the purest fountains of classical literature, he devoted himself to the study of philosophy. His ambition seems to have been to satisfy the longings of his soul after knowledge, and to be known by no higher title than that of Justin the philosopher.

His first attempts were with a Stoic. But as Justin's aspirations, rising above the earthly, were grasping after something heavenly and divine, which his instructor did not profess to teach, but treated even with derision, he was abandoned for a Peripatetic. Retaining his disciple a few days, he demanded a fee, and showed so mercenary and sordid a spirit, that Justin turned away in disgust. Full of desire and hope, his next resort was to a Pythagorean. But his new teacher required, as an essential to the study of his philosophy, a knowledge of music, astronomy and geometry, in which Justin being deficient, was unceremoniously dismissed. Disheartened by repeated disappointments, his hopes were again revived by meeting with a distinguished Platonist; and the dissatisfied, inquiring spirit of Justin, now turned to the almost divine philosophy of Plato. Here his success was better than in the former instances, and he imagined that he was advancing to the knowledge which his soul so ardently desired. But he was to experience another, yet happy disappointment. God was leading him in a way that he knew not, that He might

bring him to a knowledge of the true heavenly wisdom, and acquaint him with His Son, Jesus Christ.

The conversion of such an individual,* not only occasions joy in heaven, but on more than one account, creates a deep interest among the redeemed on earth. Viewed simply as an interesting psychological phenomenon, it deserves more than a passing notice. The place of this great change is fixed, with a good degree of probability, at Ephesus, whither Justin had gone, journeying in search of truth. The account of it, given by himself, in his dialogue with Trypho the Jew, is substantially the following: Captivated by the doctrines of Plato, he was one day walking alone, in some retired spot by the sea shore, engaged, as his habit was, in silent contemplation. Unexpectedly were his solitary musings disturbed by the appearance of an aged man, whom, on chancing to look behind him, he discovered approaching. The stranger bore a gentle, but venerable and dignified appearance, and Justin gazed with silent wonder, until the other addressed him. A mutual explanation followed as to the different objects of their visit to this place. On Justin's informing the venerable stranger that he had retired to this spot to indulge in his philosophical speculations, he was surprised to hear him answer—" *Then you are a (φιλόλογος) lover of discourse, but by no means a lover of deeds or truth, nor do you aim to be a man of action so much as a disputant (σοφιστής).*" This led Justin to offer a defense of his philosophy, and to eulogize it as the most worthy and ennobling of pursuits. Drawing from him a definition of philosophy and its end, the aged man proceeded to demonstrate its weakness, and inability to accomplish even what was claimed for it; whilst it utterly failed to meet some of our most important wants, leaving us in ignorance or doubt as to the condition and destiny of the soul. As Justin listened, the words sunk deep into his heart, his happy dreams of possessing true wisdom fled, and feeling the foundations on which he had been standing begin to shake, he exclaimed in the bitterness of sore disappointment—" *On what teacher then can one rely, or whence can he look for aid, if these doctrines contain not the truth?*" This was the important crisis in the life of Justin, as when the smitten Saul said, " *Who art thou Lord?*" and, " *What wilt thou have me to do?*" Convinced that the cisterns from which he had been endeavoring to quench his thirst, were only broken cisterns, happily the old man was able to point him to the fountain of living water. Instead of Pythagoras and Plato, he directed him to Moses and the Prophets, with the admonition, above all things, to pray that God might

give him the true wisdom, which comes from above through Jesus Christ. Having thus advised him, this stranger immediately departed, and Justin saw him no more, until they met before the throne in the presence of the Lamb. A fire had been kindled in the heart of Justin, which continued to burn, and he forsook everything else for the study of the scriptures, where he soon rejoiced in finding the pearl of great price. Then seeking out the friends of Jesus, like the sheep that has long wandered, he found rest and safety in the fold of the Redeemer.

The previous study and discipline of Justin, had not been without their value. That the world might have time to try the evils of false systems of religion, and the vanity of human wisdom in correcting them, four thousand years were suffered to elapse before "grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." Justin was allowed to make a painful passage through various systems of philosophy, to test their utter inefficiency to satisfy the soul, before he was led to the fountain of all wisdom, and made a partaker of eternal life. Two things especially prepared him for a more ready and immediate decision to embrace the new doctrine. He was already well disgusted with many of those who professed themselves philosophers. "Most of them," says he, "have never been anxious to ascertain whether there is one God, or a plurality of Gods; whether their providence extends to each one of us, or not; as if the knowledge of such points had no connection with our happiness." Then what he had observed in the conduct of christians, had made a deep impression. He tells us, "when I was adhering to the doctrines of Plato, and hearing the christians accused, saw them fearless in regard to, death, and all other things considered objects of dread, I thought it impossible that they should indulge in wickedness and voluptuousness." With such views and feelings, it required but little more to make the ardent Platonist a devoted disciple of Christ.

The conversion of Justin, like that of Paul and Augustine, took place after he had arrived at mature years. In what year of his life is not certain, but it is usually fixed at about the thirtieth—an age when he could not be charged with a want of ripened judgment, on the one hand, or of having lost ability for worldly enjoyment by reason of years, on the other. It is just the period in life when such a change most commands our admiration and confidence.

Henceforth we are to contemplate Justin in an entirely different character. Retaining his love of truth, with an ardent desire for its promulgation, he became a philosopher and

teacher in the school of Christ. Conceiving of religion as having to do with the heart, and not consisting in outward appearance, without renouncing the habit or profession of a philosopher, he continued to wear the cloak, and would thus inculcate the idea that christianity is the true philosophy. We would perhaps have a tolerably correct idea of Justin's subsequent life and labors, if we were to conceive of him travelling from place to place, much in the character of one of the old philosophers, only teaching the doctrines and precepts of christianity. Into holy orders, in the modern acceptation of that phrase, he never entered. His labors, therefore, were quite different from those of a regular pastor, and do not even correspond with our conceptions of an evangelist. If we must give his office a scriptural designation, it would be that of "teacher," (διδασκαλος) (Eph. 4:2). Nor will this character appear at all strange, when it is called to mind, that at this early period the distinction was not so widely drawn between clergy and laity. The sacerdotal caste was not yet established in the church, but with appropriate officers, the kingdom of God was advancing under the idea of christians being a universal priesthood. It would, therefore, be great injustice to the fame of this devoted servant of Christ, to estimate his position and labors by the modern standard, where nearly everything is left to those who minister officially in holy things. Justin travelled extensively, visiting the churches in Asia, Africa and Europe, and lending all his influence to the edification of believers, and the extension of Christ's kingdom, by winning souls to the truths of the gospel.

Very different judgments have been formed of Justin's intellectual character and attainments. Like most other men, who have occupied conspicuous positions in church or state, he has had admiring friends, whose partiality may have led them to exaggerate his merits, whilst others have been disposed to detract from his just worth. The early christian writers uniformly speak of him in terms of the highest veneration and regard. Without attempting an analysis of his mental qualities, a few general observations may be offered, which is all our limits will admit. Confessedly Justin's was not an intellect of the highest order. He possessed neither the logic of an Aristotle, nor the poetic sensibility of a Plato. No one would compare him in grasp of intellect with a Chrysostom or an Augustine. Closeness of reasoning or splendor of imagery are not to be looked for in his writings. As a biblical critic he was very deficient, possessing neither a knowledge of the original language of the Old Testament, nor any well defined

principles of interpretation. Hence he added little to a critical understanding of the scriptures, and built up no doctrinal system like Paul, and Augustine, and our own Luther. But if we are not to look in Justin for the mighty reasoner, the eloquent orator, the profound critic, or the equipped theologian, it would be uncharitable and unjust to deny or depreciate his great merits. Though not an intellect of the first order, he had an active, inquiring mind, an ardent love for truth, and was justly admired for his extensive and varied attainments. His lack of Hebrew was in some degree made up by a very intimate acquaintance with the scriptures in his own vernacular tongue. The Septuagint version of the Old Testament, so important on various grounds to a clear understanding of the new, he had carefully studied, and so familiar was he with its inspired pages, that he could quote it freely and at length from memory. The orators, poets, and especially the philosophers of Greece, had been his chief study and delight before he was led to the store-house of heavenly wisdom. The treasures of Grecian philosophy and literature he had secured, and made them an offering to the gospel of Christ. He united literary and philosophic culture with christian humility, and commends himself to us as a warm hearted, zealous, devoted and courageous disciple of Christ, employing his powers and attainments rather to make christians, than to win a fame for distinction in the world of science and letters.

Though a travelling christian philosopher, Justin was somewhat voluminous as an author. According to Eusebius, "he left many monuments of a mind well disciplined, and devoted to sacred things." This historian mentions two apologies addressed to Roman emperors, two works against the Greeks, a work on the "sovereignty of God," a "psalter," "remarks on the soul," a dialogue with Trypho the Jew, a work against Marcion, and adds: "there are also many other works of his in the hands of many of our brethren." Other writers mention some other productions, but most of these have been lost, and of those remaining, it is still, and likely to continue a question, what are the genuine writings of the Martyr? Semisch, who has devoted special attention to Justin and his works, receives as genuine the two apologies, the dialogue with Trypho, the exhortation to the Greeks, and a fragment on the resurrection. Several other productions, handed down as Justin's, are rejected as spurious. Neander differs somewhat from Semisch, and would ascribe less to Justin. The learned are not agreed, and we have not the ability, if we had the time and disposition, to add anything towards a settling of the dis-

puted questions. The first three are almost universally received as the works of Justin, whilst about the others there is much more uncertainty; and these genuine remains are among the most valuable writings of christian antiquity.

Justin's chief labors as an author were apologetic, and perhaps gave rise to numerous publications of the same character in that and the following century. His first effort in this department, was an apology or defence, addressed to the emperor Antonius Pius, in his own name; "I, Justin, son of Priscus, grandson of Bacchius, of Flavia Neapolis, in Syria, Palestine . . . in behalf of men above every other race unjustly hated and traduced, being myself one of them." This apology was written at Rome, and about A. D., 138 or 139. It breathes a spirit of noble independence, and illustrates the inspired declaration, "God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind." Altogether worthy of an apostle is his language in this apology, when he says, "Everywhere you are called pious and philosophic, guardians of justice, and friends of learning; it will now be shown whether you are really such: for we do not approach you in order to flatter or please you by this address, but in order that, after a strict and careful examination, you may do us justice, and not condemn yourselves by yielding to prejudice, or to the desire of pleasing superstitious men, or to irrational feeling, or to long standing calumnies. For we hold that no one can do evil against us, if we are not convicted of a misdeed, or as evil doers. You are able, indeed, to kill us, but you cannot injure us." The effect of this appeal to the emperor we cannot now ascertain, but it could hardly fail of making some impression. The christians, however, continuing to suffer persecution, some twenty-five years later, Justin addressed another apology to the Roman Senate under the successor of Antonius Pius, the admired and celebrated Marcus Aurelius. Notwithstanding all the boasted virtues of this philosophic prince, the inoffensive disciples of Christ endured increased sufferings, being sought out, put to torture, and if firm, paying for their religion with their lives. It was under his reign that the venerable Polycarp received the crown of martyrdom, and the churches of Lyons and Vienna furnished so many witnesses to seal the truth with their blood. A special case at Rome, of a woman, who was persecuted by her own husband, involving also others in suffering and death, greatly excited Justin, and led him to make his second appeal to the public authorities. He could not remain silent and witness these shameful wrongs, without an effort to convince the public

mind that christians merited no such cruelties. Though fully conscious of his own danger, and declaring his convictions that his own life must be the forfeit, he stood forth as the defender of his brethren ; and with a consciousness of the righteousness of his cause that made him both intrepid and patient, appealed for justice to an injured and suffering people.

It was most likely, in the interval between these two apologies, that Justin being at Ephesus, met with Trypho the Jew, and held that discussion, the substance of which we have in the dialogue with this individual. In it he meets the prominent objections brought against christianity by the Jews, and urges its claims to their acceptance. This dialogue may serve to give us some idea of what the religion of Christ had to encounter in making its way among the descendants of Abraham ; and we discern in the Jewish mind at that period, the same prejudices that prevailed at an earlier day, and which continue to the present time.

A further brief notice of Justin's labors in the department of apologetics, may not be out of place. In opposing and refuting the errors that resisted the gospel, he had to contend with three parties, Jews, Heathen and Heretics. His works against the latter have perished in the lapse of ages, and we can only judge of their character from doubtful fragments, or the accounts of later writers. Our notice will, therefore, be confined to the two former—Jews and Heathen.

The leading objections of the Jews, as represented by Trypho, related to the Messiahship of Jesus, and the opposition of christianity to their theocracy. They could not receive as their Messiah, one who had so little in his outward appearance and circumstances to command their attention or win their homage. 'The scriptures,' said Trypho, 'oblige us to wait for him as glorious and great, receiving as the son of man the everlasting kingdom from the ancient of days : but he whom you call your Messiah lived dishonored and inglorious, so as to fall under the last curse in the law of God ; for he was crucified.' This, as in the days of the Savior's ministry, was to the carnal minded Jew a stone of offence. In the glory that was to follow the coming of Christ, he overlooked his humiliation and suffering, that must precede it. To this objection Justin opposed the predictions of their own prophets, foretelling an humble, suffering and crucified Redeemer. Many passages of more than doubtful application, and many fanciful interpretations are pressed into service, but still, after these are left out, there remain the full and clear announce-

ments of prophecy, showing that Jesus of Nazareth is the promised Redeemer of the Old Testament. But whilst proving his true humanity, and as "a man of sorrows," Justin demonstrates his claim to the highest honors, and shows that to him belongs a glory even beyond that claimed by the Jews for their expected Messiah. The objection arising from the opposition of christianity to the theocracy, on the ground that it abolished the institutions of Moses, and that it ascribed to Christ honors belonging only to God, was met by showing the temporal design of these institutions, and how they ended in Christ, who had introduced the dispensation to which these were preparatory; and that Christ was known and worshipped by the fathers, it being none other than he who had again and again manifested himself before his coming in the flesh. The various theophanies of the Old Testament he applies to Christ—for, says he, "neither Abraham, nor Isaac, nor any other of mankind, have seen the Father . . . but him who, according to his counsel is his Son and God." Christians, therefore, are not justly chargeable with opposition to the theocracy, as they neither reject the divine origin of the ceremonial institutions under the law, nor do they worship another being instead of God; but they have now received the substance of which these ceremonies were only types, and in Christ they worship him, "whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting."

Justin did not satisfy himself with defending christianity from the charges brought by the Jews, he made an aggressive movement on Judaism, and demonstrated the fallacy of their views and hopes. At length does he expose their false interpretations, their perversions, and egregious trifling with the inspired record, and charges upon them blindness of understanding in not recognizing in Jesus 'him of whom Moses and the prophets did write.' Their boasted claim as the peculiar people of God, and their hopes based on the observance of the Mosaic rites, he shows will avail them nothing, and unless they believe on the crucified Redeemer they will perish in their sins, and suffer forever the pains of remorse amidst devouring fire. He argues and pleads with the children of Abraham, as one who felt 'the vantage ground of truth,' and who was deeply anxious to have conviction wrought in the minds of those who were in the darkness of error.

The objections of the heathen were numerous, and urged with no little zeal. From our point of view they may seem strange, but to them they no doubt had weight, and strengthened them in their adherence to their false systems. Christians were charged with being atheists, immoral, and enemies to the

State. The first charge they founded in the fact that the professors of christianity had no visible objects of worship, and refused to take any part in the acts of homage to pagan idols. Not to acknowledge and worship the gods of the country, was viewed by them as equivalent to a denial of the divine existence. This charge Justin met by an acknowledgement that they did not honor their idols, but worshipped the true and living God, who created and sustains all things, and who stands in no need of our offerings. And further, he shows the inconsistency of condemning them for worshipping a different being, since even among the heathens, they have not the same gods, nor the same religious rites. Whatever force his representations may have had on these idolaters, to us they seem perfectly conclusive, and just such as an enlightened christian might present at the present day.

The infamous charge of the grossest sins—such as incest, feeding on the blood of infants slain in their religious rites, and the like—Justin refutes by an appeal to their doctrines, which inculcate, on pain of divine wrath and exclusion from Paradise, the denial of all ungodliness, and the practice of every virtue. Impurity, even in thought, he shows is condemned, and the strictest holiness in heart and life enjoined. Here Justin could with advantage oppose to the doctrines and precepts of heathen moralists, the pure morality of the New Testament. On this ground the friends of Jesus can bid defiance to the enemies of christianity in every age, for they are compelled to admit the moral excellence of Christ's teaching.

A most serious objection in the minds of heathen statesmen was the influence of the new religion on the peace and permanence of the government. Such men, always jealous of political influence, and dreading dangers, anticipated them from several quarters. The disciples of Christ, separating themselves from the pagan worship, held secret or private meetings, which were deemed prejudicial to the public safety, they would not render divine homage to the emperor, and they spoke of another king who was to reign over all the earth. The feeling of Herod, when he heard that one was born who should be king of the Jews, seems to have possessed the Roman Emperors, and as they looked upon the pretensions and growth of christianity, they were apprehensive for the safety not only of their religion, but of their civil authority. These fears were entirely groundless, so far as any design on the part of christians against the government was concerned, or any direct tendency to overthrow the existing political institutions. This Justin showed, when he assured them that although un-

willing to render divine honors to any mere man, they were ready to render full obedience to the laws in all civil affairs. They indeed prayed for the welfare of the State, and behaved themselves as good and quiet citizens. Of the kingdom which they expected, and which was to embrace all nations, they need have no fears, for its great Founder had said, "my kingdom is not of this world.

The mean condition of christians—the late introduction of christianity—the person of Christ—his resurrection, were all made points of attack, to which Justin made suitable and satisfactory answers. Indeed we are struck with the sameness of the old heathen and the modern infidel objections to christianity. Amidst continual shifting and turning among infidels in their opposition to the gospel—"Is there any thing whereof it may be said, see this is new? It hath been already of old time, which was before us." We would venture to commend to our modern infidels the study of church history in the early ages, and they will find that their most popular objections are nothing more than old heathen prejudices, which, after the lapse of more than a thousand years, have had a resurrection.

Besides meeting and refuting the various objections urged by the heathen, he shows the utter unworthiness of the various systems of religion in practice among them. Poets, to whom the masses were most indebted for their theology, or rather mythology, have given absurd and revolting pictures of the gods, so that their teaching was discarded by the wisest of their philosophers; whilst these philosophers in turn, had not been a whit more successful in their attempts to enlighten mankind on the most important points touching the Divine Being and the religion that he requires. Their perpetual contradictions, absurdities and deficiencies are exposed, whilst whatever is worthy of our regard, is shown either to have been derived from the scriptures, or to illustrate and confirm their teaching. Justin's very extensive acquaintance with heathen literature, qualified him to manage this part of the subject with advantage. Our own partialities are very strong for this part of the argument in favor of a divine revelation. The glaring fact that "the world by wisdom knew not God," is a grand demonstration of our need of some better teacher than human reason. Here we would meet the modern boasters of the sufficiency of nature's light, and who deny our need of any written revelation to guide us, and point them to the illustrious names in the annals of paganism, all ignorant of the true and living God, all in some form idolaters, and the wisest and best of them all confessing the need, and breathing the hope of a divine

teacher, sent to enlighten us in regard to God. Christian writers have very generally been too well satisfied with defending the out-posts of our holy religion, and warding off attacks. War should be waged in the very heart of the enemy's country, and the weakness of their positions displayed. Old paganism crumbled and fell when its weakness was pointed out, and so must modern infidelity and a godless philosophy, when their errors and absurdities are thoroughly exposed. There is nothing they so much dread as investigation, and being brought to the test of sober reason and stubborn, unanswerable facts.

Perhaps Justin's most successful labors as an apologist, are when he plants himself on the character of christianity, and from its very nature and effects argues its heavenly origin. We have great confidence in the self evidencing power of the gospel. Against all the arguments *a priori* and *a posteriori*, we would trust a man's own sensibilities, as he gazes on the face of nature on a fine spring morning, or lifts his eyes to the midnight heavens, for the belief in a Supreme Being. Though he might be unable to frame a single argument, he *feels* there is a God. And so with christianity. It is itself the best evidence of being divine. About Kant's *practical reason*, or our moral sense, we will not speculate; but let an honest and sincere seeker after truth study the gospel of Christ, and he will have evidence enough that it is more than human. Johnson assigned the true cause of the unbelief of distinguished infidels, when he said they would not read the New Testament. Besides the miracles and prophecies of the Bible upon which Justin properly laid great stress, he appealed with entire confidence to the doctrines and effects of christianity. The doctrines of christianity are truly worthy of their divine author—sublime and Godlike. Beyond the discovery of human reason, they win the profound homage of the greatest thinkers, and elevate our thoughts far beyond what unaided reason could attain. From the time of Paul to the present hour, the noblest intellects have seen in the cross of Christ the transcendent wisdom of God. Not only patriarchs, prophets and apostles have contemplated the work of human redemption with wonder and amazement, but "into these things the angels desire to look." The moral effects of the gospel are such as the prophets foretold. Men are completely transformed, and made new creatures in Christ Jesus. Paul attests the wonder working power of the gospel, and the same pictures are presented by Justin. It would be interesting to transfer to our pages some of his descriptions of the wonderful changes wrought in character by the religion of Jesus. These exhibitions of pri-

mitive christianity are most refreshing. But we have not room to copy enough to give any just conception of what Justin and other early advocates have to say of the divine power which this religion exercised over those who embraced it. To him it was no beautiful vision, but a divine reality. "This alone I have found infallible and profitable philosophy." . . . "This is sweeter than honey, as you may perceive from this, that we do not deny his name, even in death itself."

Justin has usually been named as the first of the early fathers who united the Grecian culture with the simple faith of the gospel, and it has been a question among the learned whether he is to be classed with the Platonizing teachers, who were distinguished in the period succeeding him, and who are known as the Alexandrian school. A decision of this question, like very many others, depends on the meaning attached to terms. That Justin was acquainted with Plato is clear—and that he employed some favorite terms of the Platonic philosophy, is equally undisputed—and that his early study of Greek philosophy in general, and Plato in particular, would exert an influence on his modes of thought and expression, necessarily results from the very constitution of the human mind; but it does not appear that he made any systematic attempt to combine or harmonize the two, or that he allowed Plato to mould his interpretation of the doctrines of Christ. From early life he had been addicted to the study of philosophy, and still retained his love for the investigation of truth, but deeming that he had found the true, divine philosophy, which he was in search of, like Paul, 'counted all things but loss for the excellency of Christ Jesus our Lord.' Neander speaks of Justin as "the precursor of the Alexandrian church-teachers," and it can hardly be doubted that his life and writings must have had an influence in forming that school. But Justin himself lived in an age when little attempts had as yet been made to give to the doctrines of the gospel any philosophical complexion. The grand facts of christianity were yet fresh in their minds, and those who embraced it were more anxious to realize its living power, than to explain its mysteries, and harmonize its truths with our subjective views.

The doctrinal views of Justin must be gathered from scattered declarations, rather than from any formal statement. The church had not yet drawn out into a full and well defined doctrinal system, the truths of the gospel, which, like those in the world of nature, lie scattered over the whole field, awaiting the labor of system-makers to reduce them to shape and order. Without entering into detail, it may be stated that he heartily

embraced and taught the leading truths of the evangelical system of doctrine; as, a trinity in unity; the incarnation; the atonement; justification by faith, with repentance towards God; the resurrection; the final judgment; and the eternity of retributions in a world to come. On some minor points it has been his good fortune to be claimed by all parties. Pedobaptists and Anti-pedobaptists, both appeal to Justin in support of their peculiar views and practices. Catholics, Lutherans, and Reformed, all claim him on the disputed point of the Savior's presence in the Eucharist; and yet it is very questionable whether any one of these parties regard it in the light which he did. He satisfies himself with scriptural representations, without attempting to explain the reason and mode of everything, and hence, like the scriptures, is liable to different interpretations. Where there has been so much difference of opinion, and so much learned discussion, we may be excused from submitting any judgment in the matter. We think, however, that without prejudice or violence, Justin may be claimed as an advocate of evangelical orthodoxy, as generally understood among Protestants. His religion had a puritanic simplicity. He certainly knew nothing of the arrogant pretensions set up by ambitious ecclesiastics in succeeding centuries, and so zealously renewed in modern times—of an ecclesiastical hierarchy composed of different orders of ministers after the Jewish fashion, of a magical influence residing in the hands of bishops, and of all that form and parade deemed so necessary to a true church, and acceptable worship. The modern figments of "apostolical succession," "sacramental grace," and the like, do not constitute any part of his religious system. Equality among Christ's ministers, the holy scriptures as the rule of faith and practice, simplicity in worship and the administration of ordinances, a pure, spiritual religion, these appear as prominent in his day. There was little that could be called *churchly* ritual, or formal. The word of God and the Spirit of God were the predominant elements in early christianity. He made no account of the Apocrypha or tradition, but held in the very highest estimation the inspired word of God. With the New Testament he does not manifest so much familiarity as the Old, perhaps owing to the fact that its several books may not yet have been collected and arranged into one volume. But without naming Paul, there are passages in his writings which show that he was not ignorant of the Pauline epistles, whilst the gospels are freely quoted, and the Apocalypse also, with a clear reference of it to John the apostle, as its author. At that early period, and especially among Jews,

it was natural for him to make more account of the Old Testament, which had long enjoyed a place among the people, and to employ it in confirming and illustrating the truths he taught, as made known by Christ and his apostles.

Justin, as was the case with many others in that age, was a believer in the pre-millennial advent, and personal reign of Christ on earth. He held that the Savior would come again in great splendor and glory, establish His throne at Jerusalem, and be seen by His enemies in the very place where He was crucified. The object of this coming is to set up His kingdom—to raise the bodies of His saints, and to make the new heavens and the new earth. The saints are to reign with Christ during this thousand years, at the end of which will be the general resurrection and the final judgment. His views on this subject are substantially those held by millenarians at the present day, and were regarded by him as a part of the orthodox faith. Trypho says, "Tell me truly, do you believe that this place, Jerusalem, will be rebuilt, and do you expect that your people will be gathered together and rejoice with Christ, and with the patriarchs and prophets, and with those of our race, and of those who become proselytes before the coming of your Christ?" Justin answers, "I and many others hold these sentiments, as you also well know that this will take place: but again, many christians, of pure and pious dispositions, do not acknowledge this, as I have made known to you. . . . But I and those christians, who are in all respects orthodox, understand that there will be a resurrection of the flesh, and a thousand years in Jerusalem rebuilt, and adorned and enlarged, as the prophets Ezekiel, and Isaiah, and others declare." . . . "A certain man," he says, "among us, named John, one of the apostles of Christ, in a revelation made to him, prophesied that the believers in our Christ will spend a thousand years in Jerusalem; and after that will be the general (and to speak briefly) the eternal resurrection of all simultaneously, and the judgment." In these views Justin has been followed by many great and good men, both in ancient and modern times, and is, therefore, entitled to a charitable judgment, however different may be our own understanding of the prophecies relating to the latter day glory. We do not ourselves believe in the theory of millenarians, but we would not exclude as heretics, those who differ from us in their interpretation of the mysteries to be revealed in future ages.

It is time that we should bring these notices of Justin to a close, and in doing so, it will be proper to advert to the termination of his earthly career. The latter part of his days seems

to have been spent at Rome, where, according to some early authorities, he had opened a school for the purpose of instructing those who were willing, in the saving truths of the gospel. His labors in this metropolis of nations could not fail of arresting some attention, and his bold, courageous defence of christianity excited bitter hostility among the enemies of the truth. Among the Cynics, a low, degenerate sect, he was especially the object of hatred and malignant persecution. One of their number, named Crescens, had made himself active in opposition to the success of the kingdom of Christ, and was very zealous in spreading slanderous stories to the injury of believers. These Justin refuted, and exposed their author to merited contempt, which only increased his hatred and desire for revenge. Justin clearly saw the storm that was gathering, and patiently awaited the hour when it would burst upon his head. In his second apology he says: "I expect to be plotted against by some of those who have been named, and to be fastened to the stake: perhaps by Crescens, that lover of noise and show." His expectations were not long in being realized. His enemies thirsted for his life, and only waited a fitting opportunity to accomplish their wishes. Justin, with six others, was arraigned before the præfect Rusticus, to undergo examination as to their religion. The præfect inquired of him—"where do you meet together?" To which Justin answered—"wherever it may suit the choice and ability of each one. You imagine that we all meet in the same place; but this is not so, for the God of the christians is not circumscribed by place." To the question, "what doctrines do you embrace?" he replied, "I have endeavored to learn all doctrines, but have closed with the true—that of the christians—though not pleasing to those who are in love with error." Further he testified, "we believe in one God, the original creator and framer of all things, visible and invisible . . . and in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, whom the prophets foretold, as a teacher of truth, and herald of salvation." To the decisive question—"Art thou then a christian?" he frankly responded, "I am a christian." When asked in derision—"Believest thou, then, in thy ascension to heaven, when I have caused thee to be scourged and beheaded?" he said—"I hope that I shall receive the gift of Christ's grace, should I thus suffer." To the question repeated a second time, if he really supposed that he should ascend to heaven, he firmly answered, "I not only suppose so, but know it with a certainty that admits of no doubt." The accused were then commanded to join in an offering to the gods, and on their resolute refusal thus to abjure their religion, the præfect

declared in anger—"If ye will not obey, ye shall be chastised without mercy." Not in the least intimidated by this threat, Justin in turn said, "we wish nothing more than to suffer for our Lord Jesus Christ, for this will give us salvation and joy at His dread tribunal, before which all the world must appear." The trial here closed; they were scourged and beheaded, and Justin secured the name by which he has since been known as the *Martyr*. His crown was "laid up in heaven," and he entered upon his career of "glory, honor and immortality," about A. D. 166.

ARTICLE II.

THE GENEALOGIES OF JESUS, IN THE EVANGELISTS MATTHEW AND LUKE.

By K. Wieseler, Professor in Göttingen.

Translated by F. A. Muhlenberg, Jr., "Franklin Prof. of Ancient Languages in Pa. Col."

THE examination of the genealogy of Christ, as is well known, has, from early times, led to the most different results. At present, the contest concerning it has almost reached its highest point. Some, as for instance Strauss, would persuade us that nothing, absolutely nothing, is known of the parents of Jesus, except that they were Jews; that, however, the two Evangelists, or the early christian church, traced back his lineage to David, because he had made the impression upon them that he was the Messiah, who was to be, in accordance with the prophecies of the Old Testament, a son of David.

This bold hypothesis they base upon the various contradictions and inaccuracies, which they think they have discovered in the two genealogical registers. Others, and by far the most, have maintained their historical credibility, whilst they have presented the proof of it, not unfrequently, in such a way that the scientific interpreter can, with difficulty, give his assent to it. In a word, he who is acquainted with the state of the inquiry will indeed admit, that a renewed, comprehensive examination of it will be by no means superfluous, the object of which will be to advance from the certain to the hypothetical, and to separate the principal from the subsidiary points.

The genealogy of a human individual has, in itself, no general interest, it obtains this only from the particular relations in

which it stands to the rest of the history of this person, or to that of other historic individuals. This holds good, in a certain sense, even as to the genealogy of the divine man, Jesus Christ. The relations, by virtue of which the genealogy of Jesus claims a general interest, are of a twofold nature: first, in so far as they are designed to be the fulfilment of an Old Testament prophecy: secondly, because they are an integral part of the canonical gospels of Matthew and Luke, and consequently allow us to derive conclusions in general, as to the greater or less historical character of these gospels.

It is an easy matter, in fact, to dispose of the first point. The descent of Jesus from David, is attested, not *only* by our two genealogical registers, but in the New Testament *throughout*, and in the history of the christian church. The Evangelist Matthew calls him expressly, in many places, a son of David. 1: 20; 9: 27; 12: 23; 15: 22; 20: 30, 31; 21: 9, 15. Besides, in the gospel of Luke, he appears as such in 1: 27, 32, 69; 2: 4; 18: 38, 39; and in the Acts of the Apostles, in the address of Peter, 2: 30; and the speech of Paul, 13: 23. That the Evangelist Mark passes by the genealogy of Jesus, is owing to the original plan of his history; but even by him, Jesus is called a son of David, 10: 47, 48. The apostle John also has not treated of the history of the childhood of Jesus. From his clearly proposed object, to instruct readers not of Jewish extraction, we might at least expect in advance, to find in him an express mention of the descent of Jesus from David. He has, it appears to me, indirectly however, alluded to it, 7: 42. This passage appears indeed, upon first view, even to favor the opposite opinion; but it is otherwise, when we look at the connection in which it stands. From v. 40 onwards, the apostle gives an account of the different impression, which the discourses of Jesus had made upon the listening people, on the last day of the feast of tabernacles. In the case of many this was very favorable; they supposed that he was either the prophet, or indeed the Messiah. Others doubted of the Messianic character of Jesus, whilst they said, v. 41, will the Messiah come out of Galilee? and v. 42, do not the Scriptures declare, that the Messiah shall be born of the seed of David, and in *Bethlehem*, the village where David was? Evidently v. 42 is meant to *confirm* the correctness of the unbelieving question contained in v. 41. This, however, is effected in such a way, that two external marks of the Messiah are brought forward from the Scriptures, the one of which, his descent from David, stands in *no* intimate relation to the doubt raised in v. 41, whether the Messiah

was to come from Galilee; the second alone, the necessity of his coming forth from Bethlehem, is presented as *confirmatory*. On account of this connection of the propositions, the first mark of the Messiah, which was also expressly mentioned, and *not* excluded by these disbelievers in Jesus, seems, therefore, to be included with the second. Here it must be carefully noticed, that the members of the Sanhedrim, who had been, according to v. 45, informed of everything that had occurred, by their servants, *only* insist upon this, to the same John, upon the *same* day, as showing the ground of their unbelief, that a prophet was not to come out of Galilee. Besides, even the representatives of the opposite belief, De Wette and Strauss, have at least not ventured to make use of, for themselves, the passage of John quoted above. If the apostle John were the author of the Apocalypse, he would then have mentioned directly, Rev. v. 5, the origin of Jesus from David. We cannot indeed accede to this view, but we thereby obtain a new witness, who must have lived and written *before* the destruction of Jerusalem, the presbyter John, as I suppose, who was likewise a disciple of Jesus.¹ Further, the apostle Paul, who was the constant cotemporary, friend and companion of the other apostles, positively maintains that Jesus, according to the flesh, was descended of the seed of David. Rom. 1: 3; 2 Tim. 2: 7. We have, still further, a multitude of accounts, in the New Testament, of proceedings before the Sanhedrim, in which the Messiahship of Christ is questioned, but in them there is nothing reported which seems like even the smallest doubt of the descent of Jesus from David. And who can believe that this most evident and palpable mark of his Messiahship, would not have been spoken of before them, if it had been wanting! We consider it superfluous, to show in detail, that the entire early church, from the very beginning onwards, were firm believers in the descent of Jesus from David. But *one* account will I here bring forward, which, at all events, confirms the above view, in an independent way, and, as critics of the most different hues acknowledge, bears the stamp of truth upon its face. The early christian father, Hegesippus, informs us in Eusebius 3: 20, that the nephews of Judas, a brother of Jesus, Matt. 13: 55; Mark 6: 3, were brought before Domitian, as they were *descended from David*, and on this account considered by him dangerous. But after he had held a personal interview with them, and become acquainted

¹ See my treatise:—The testimony of Papias concerning the presbyter John, in the theological contributions, published by the Faculty of Kiel, 1840. Part IV.

with their uprightness, and the laborious way in which they were obliged to earn their bread, they were restored to their liberty. If now the *brothers* of Jesus were descended from David, Jesus himself must also have been of kindred origin. In accordance with these numerous and varied testimonies, nothing is, in fact, more certain, than that Jesus was a son of David. This truth does not at all depend upon the state of our genealogical registers in Matthew and Luke, is altogether independent of the question, whether these, in their actual state, can be shown as entirely historical or not. Much more, on the other hand, by the reception of these into the connected history of the New Testament and the most ancient christian church, according to which Jesus was actually a son of David, we have secured for ourselves, for their consideration, the only *historical* stand-point.

We proceed now to the more difficult question, whether or not, and to what extent, the two genealogical registers of the descent of Jesus, in their *separate* statements, dare lay claim to historical credibility. If the denial indeed, of the origin of Jesus from David, appears to transcend the limits of all sound historical criticism, the state of the two genealogical registers of Jesus, which have been given to us by the two evangelists, especially with our present genealogical knowledge, is undoubtedly such, that even a circumspect critic might be perplexed, in reference to the truth in their details. Their exegetical history,¹ which discloses so many different solutions of the problem, compels us to acknowledge this. If we should, however, assume that our two accounts are directly contradictory to each other, on the one hand, this only would immediately follow, that *one* of the two genealogies was so far unhistorical. On the other hand, we would know from the preceding discussion, that the mean of *both* registers, the descent of Jesus from the house of David, and with it the conclusion, that in Him the Old Testament predictions, having reference thereto, were fulfilled, in any event was true. The former assumption, however, would have, if we reasoned consistently, a definite influence upon our judgment, as to the historical character of the labors of the one or the other evangelist. We would be obliged openly to admit, that traditions, or myths, or whatever we choose to call them, *even though only in certain*

¹ From the present exegesis, it may at least be regarded as certain, that the γενεαλογίαι, in the pastoral letters 1 Tim. 1:4, Tit. 3:9, dare not be appealed to, in discussions concerning the lineage of Jesus.

portions, as the history of the childhood of Jesus, had made such a powerful impression upon them, that a not inconsiderable number of names, apparently altogether historical, could be *invented*, or at least thrown together in an entirely unhistorical manner, in general, *for the sake of some definite, even though unknown motive*, though in this case, with the design of giving in detail the lineage of Jesus from David. We have now evidently designated the point, where the view of the genealogies of Christ, according to the most recent mode of treating the evangelical history, directly exerts its power, and touches a question of present interest, which must be settled chiefly by the theologians of the present time.

With reference to this, we will place our inquiry, in what follows, at once in this form, whether it is probable, or whether it can be shown with absolute certainty, that our evangelists, or the early christian churches, from which they derived their genealogical information, fabricated the account of the descent of Christ from David, in the special form in which they communicated it, without the necessary *historical* knowledge. In this state of the inquiry, we have no need of examining further, whether the two genealogical registers may possibly have been in error or not, in places where, as is conceded, they closely followed what was *at hand* and *acknowledged*, namely the Old Testament, or a tradition of an earlier origin, as in Matt. 1: 5; with reference to the word Rahab, and Luke 3: 36, as regards the name Cainan, borrowed from the Septuagint. Still, we believe by this intentional limitation of the question, we will bring forward the essential points of the subject, as on the other hand, it is indeed undeniable, that the question, whether any and how much mythical or traditional matter is to be acknowledged as existing in the different gospels, cannot be truly decided by general suppositions and categories, but only by the most thorough and searching examination into *particulars*.

We will examine, first of all, the historical character of the registers *in general*. An account is, upon the whole, more or less credible, in proportion as the attendant circumstances, in which it is found, can lay claim to credibility or not. If we apply this rule to our genealogies, these would a priori have the suspicion of a want of truthfulness, if the gospels in which they are communicated, in general, or in the section of which these form integral parts, that is, in the history of the childhood of Jesus,¹ were entirely unhistorical in their character. We

¹ In consequence of the position of the genealogical register in the Evan-

are convinced, with the christian church from the very earliest times, for sufficient reasons, as we think, of the opposite; and believe we have recently, for our own part, furnished many proofs in its favor.¹

But perhaps what is here reported, had reference to circumstances, of which the informants themselves *were able* to know but little, and for which, persons in general felt but little *interest*, and these again, would be cogent reasons for suspecting the credibility of the narrative. But exactly in these points, the historical view has, from the very outset, its very strong supports. Every one who is acquainted with the Old Testament knows, that the Israelites belong to those nations who, from time immemorial, have placed the greatest value upon their descent and family registers, and these among them have constantly stood, in the closest relation to the internal form of their social existence, as a nation and a theocracy. The disadvantages which were usually connected with the loss of their family registers, even after their captivity, appear from Ez. 2: 62, Neh. 7: 64. What now justifies us in assuming, that forsooth the family of *Jesus* should thoughtlessly manifest no anxiety for their family register? Nay, is it not more in accordance with the circumstances, that the most distinguished Jewish house, the royal line of David, upon which the promises were resting, would be especially careful for the preservation of its genealogy? Yet persons have appealed, in opposition to this case, to the account of Julius Africanus in Eusebius² 1: 7, that Herod, because he had sprung from an undistinguished family, and one not Jewish, (in the city of Ascalon) had tyrannically caused the family registers of the Jews, preserved in the public archives, to be destroyed. In any case, this somewhat late account testifies, that the Jews of that period placed a high value upon their family registers; besides this, apart from the fact that in it the burning of the *public* genealogical registers is spoken of, the most decisive considerations speak against the correctness of it. Before all others, Josephus, a *cotemporary*, ought here to be heard. He not

gelist Luke, we may venture, and not without reason, to doubt whether it was *always* communicated *only* in connection with the history of the childhood of Jesus. The opposite indeed is, from the very first, probable, in consequence of the absorbing interest, which was felt in the Messianic evidences of the descent of Jesus from David.

¹ In the paper: Chronological Synopsis of the four evangelists. A contribution in defence of the gospels and gospel history, uninfluenced by preconceived opinions.

² Cruse's Eusebius. Lib. I. c. 7.

only nowhere mentions the destruction of these genealogical registers, but *expressly* attests the existence of them, at the time of the writing of his autobiography, in which he asserts, that he took the account of his descent from the public records.¹

This, according to all the rules of criticism, would be sufficient to show the want of historical accuracy in the account of Africanus. Notwithstanding this, it may be observed, that this very Herod, according to the gospel of Luke, even towards the end of his life, prevented the census of the Jewish nation, with reference to its division into tribes² and families, during which Jesus was born in Bethlehem, or if we wish to doubt the historical character of this account, which, for our purposes, amounts to the same thing, is said to have prevented, and that the author of the ancient Protevang. Jacobi c. 1, assumes the existence of the public genealogical registers³ at that time. That in the time of Africanus, many Jewish families were without trustworthy genealogical registers, is not only expressly asserted by him, but is in itself also very credible, inasmuch as, since the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple, and the dissolution of the Jewish government, the peculiar point of union for the Jewish nation had for a long time been lost, and the people, scattered in all parts of the world, were obliged to feel the pains of the most oppressive servitude. However, if that church father shows himself inclined to believe the account, that the later want of family registers had its origin from the burning of the copies kept in the public archives, by the command of Herod the Great, he believes in a manifest error, which may have had its origin originally in a prejudiced hostility of the Jews against the correctness of the genealogy of Christ, as given by our evangelists, or perhaps in this, that the Jews afterwards were accustomed to ascribe to that Herod all possible acts of wickedness. It follows, that persons, in the time when the genealogies of Jesus, recorded in our gospels, had their origin, could easily and confidently inform themselves about them, either by means of private writings or from public documents, or by tradition. And indeed neither the inclination nor a motive for this could well have been wanting. For what more nearly concerned christians, especially the christians of Palestine, or Jewish christians, than the examination and proof of the fact, that Jesus, whom

¹ Life of Josephus. §1, towards the close.

² See my chronological synopsis, p. 105 sq.

³ Cf. Thilo, cod. Apocryph. I. p. 166 sq. concerning the expression then used, ἡ δωδεκάφυλος.

they acknowledged as the Messiah, had actually sprung, as the prophecies of the Old Testament declare, from the house of David. Against a too hasty and inaccurate proof, they were preserved by the apprehension, which was also indeed realized in cases somewhere occurring, that so ready a control could be exercised over their assertions by their opponents. In general, however, the suspicion that the mere wish of having Jesus the son of David produced our genealogies, would from the outset take root more readily, if *this* proposition did not already stand upon a firm base, without at all regarding these genealogies, that Jesus really was descended from David. Upon a conscientious review of all these considerations, it can hardly be considered a prejudiced opinion, if we conclude that these two genealogical registers, in advance of all examination of them, have the presumption of credibility, even in their details, in their favor. Still we are obliged to examine, whether this presumption will be sustained by a closer investigation, having reference to the *particulars* of the inquiry.

As we have two different accounts of the genealogy of Jesus, it will be necessary to harmonize them, and in doing this in difficult questions, we will be most securely preserved from inaccuracy and hasty conclusions, if each account be first examined by itself, in its own peculiar connection; and then be compared with the one corresponding to it. Before we proceed in this way, we will briefly touch upon a charge, which is brought against our evangelists, by not a few exegetical writers. They say, these men who denied all coöperation of Joseph in the begetting of Jesus, could not prepare a genealogical register from him, without contradicting themselves. These mutually exclusive views and accounts, say they, are to be ascribed much more to different circles of tradition, and notwithstanding, at the same time, received by the evangelists, without observing the contradictions in which they thereby involved themselves. How simple or inconsiderate indeed, do they imagine the poor evangelists to have been! Why should not Jesus have had a proper genealogy, when Joseph himself recognized him as his son; Matt. 1: 25, and not a natural son, inasmuch as, according to both evangelists, he was born from the womb of Mary? Besides, both give us to understand, even within the registers themselves, that Jesus was not the natural son of Joseph. Scholastic prejudice should not introduce inconsistencies into the biblical text, if they are not to be found there.

We will now examine the genealogy in the gospel of Matthew *by itself*. There can be, from Matt. 1: 16, no doubt, that the genealogy of Joseph is communicated by this evangelist, who according to him, Matt. 1: 25, was the legal father of Jesus. For the purpose of proving the correctness of this genealogical register, in its separate state, we have at present the two helps, viz: the accounts of the Old Testament, so far as this gives the history of the descent of David, and secondly, the concluding explanation of the genealogist himself, Matt. 1: 17. The Old Testament parallel extends from Abraham to Zerubbabel, Matt. 1: 2-13; we may compare Gen. 21: 2, 25: 25, 26, 35: 23, 38: 29, 30, 46: 12; Ruth 4: 18-22; 1 Chron. 3: 1-19. In general, these passages correspond perfectly, there are only wanting, between Joram and Uzziah, the three names of Ahaziah, Joash and Amaziah; 2 Kings, 8: 24; 1 Chron. 3: 2; 2 Chron. 22: 1. 11; 24: 27; 26: 1; further, there is wanting, between Josiah and Jehoiachin, v. 11,¹ Jehoiakim, as the last individual was the son of Josiah, and Jehoiachin was properly the grandson of Josiah: 2 Kings 23: 34; 24: 6; 1 Chron. 3: 15, 16. Finally, it may appear strange to us, that among the descendants of Zerubbabel mentioned in Matt. 1: 13 sq., no one of those given in 1 Chron. 3: 19 sq. is found. On the other hand, he involves himself in no difficulty by calling, as he does, Matt. 1: 12, Zerubbabel the son of Salathiel; whilst in 1 Chron. 3: 19, he appears as the son of Pedaiiah. For that the same person was in some sense or other called a son of Salathiel, appears from the contemporary prophet, Haggai, 1: 1, 12, 14; 2: 3; and from Ez. 3: 2. 8; 5: 2; and Neh. 12: 1. Whence these irregularities and departures from the text of the Old Testament? Want of acquaintance with it, could not, by any possibility, have been the reason, in the case of Matthew, of whom a constant use of the Old Testament is exactly characteristic. Possibly then inattention! This is also very improbable. For-

¹ The words, his brothers, are most accurately explained to mean, the uncles of Jehoiachin, the natural brothers of his father, Jehoiakim: 1 Chron. 3: 15, and of his future posterity; according to a mode of expression which had been already sanctioned in other places of the Old Testament, as for instance, in the case of Abraham, with reference to his nephew Lot: Gen. 13: 8; 14: 16; of Jacob to Laban: Gen. 29: 12. 15, and indeed of one of these uncles, his royal successor Zedekiah: 2 Chron. 36: 10, compared with 2 Kings 24: 17; Jer. 37: 1. That Jehoiachin had natural brothers, appears to me, even after the explanation of Ebrard in his Scientific Examination of the Evangelical History, p. 201, very doubtful, inasmuch as the words, *וְאֶחָיו*, 1 Chron. 3: 16, are probably a later addition, from the context, readily explained. On the other hand, I would not, with Kuinoel and Fritzsche, maintain that the words "and his brothers," are spurious.

tunately, the author *himself*, for the purpose of removing this suspicion, gives the reason, at the close of his genealogy. After having given the summary of the above-mentioned heads of families, he says: All the generations, therefore, from Abraham to David, are fourteen generations, and from David to the carrying away into Babylon, are fourteen generations, and from the carrying away into Babylon unto Christ, are fourteen generations. This much at once appears, that it was an important consideration with him, that in the three periods mentioned, *exactly* fourteen generations, and neither more nor less, should be mentioned. But it has been a disputed point, how the fourteen generations are to be counted. From Abraham to David, both inclusive, there are indeed fourteen generations, from David exclusive to Jehoiachin, inclusive, are also fourteen generations; lastly, from Jehoiachin exclusive to Jesus, are but thirteen generations. Our author, therefore, must have counted differently, for that he, who had given himself the trouble to count beforehand, the fourteen generations for the three periods, did not merely make a *mistake* in his calculation, is evident to the superficial observer. I pass by the expedient of inserting Jehoiakim between Josiah and Jehoiachin, v. 11, which is found indeed in many later codd.¹ and approved of by Rinck quite recently, in his *Disputed Narratives in the Life of Jesus*, p. 22. Not any more satisfactory is the opinion of Ebrard, who endeavors to gain the fourteenth generation of the third division, by taking into the calculation as a *peculiar* generation, the name of Mary, mentioned in Matt. 1: 16. For it is manifest, from the connection, that Mary is only here mentioned, for the purpose of showing that Jesus was the natural son of Mary, not of Joseph, and how can we bring father and mother, as two *different* generations, into the account? The genealogist must have reckoned however, in such a way, as to count at least *one*² of the concluding names of the first or second class, *twice*, in order to bring out his 3 × 14 generations.

¹ They read: Josiah however begat Jehoiakim, and Jehoiakim begat Jehoniah, sqq.

² Olshausen, Meyer and others, count *both* concluding names twice, and thereby obtain the following division of the genealogy: From Abraham to David inclusive, fourteen generations, from David to Josiah, both inclusive, fourteen generations, from Josiah to Joseph, both included, fourteen generations. A fourth and new class then begins with Jesus, which stands alone. But this division is untenable on this account, inasmuch as the *to* of v. 17, always includes the name introduced with it, and therefore Christ is excluded from being considered an *independent* member of the genealogy.

The first view we may regard as the one most prevalent at present, upon which supposition, the second division will be closed with Josiah, and the third opened with Jehoiachin. It is customary to quote for this view, the double mention of David in v. 17, as is done by Fritzsche, De Wette and others. Yet we cannot see how such a conclusion can, with reason, be derived from this verse. For, on the one hand, the double mention of David ("to David—from David") is necessarily required by the thought to be expressed; on the other hand, "the carrying away into Babylon," is also mentioned twice, for the same reason. We much rather agree entirely with Strauss, who contends for a double mention of Jehoiachin, first, at the close of the second, and again at the commencement of the third division. This calculation can be sustained by v. 17. According to this verse, the second class closes with the "carrying away," inasmuch as the "until," on account of the equality, must be *constantly* taken inclusively. Besides this explanation of "until," the words of v. 12, "after they were brought to Babylon," expressly favor. If now, "the carrying away" is to be regarded as an *integral* and also concluding part of the second division, so also must Jehoiachin, who here represents the "carrying away," be considered as an integral, and indeed closing member of it. Whichever name, however, is to be *twice* counted, David or Jehoiachin, the "from" of v. 17 is used *twice* inclusively, before Abraham, and either before David or before the "carrying away," and only once exclusively, and for this reason, that otherwise, in the division beginning with this "from," there would result more than fourteen generations. Finally, it appears, upon which for our purpose we must place particular stress, that it is altogether a matter of indifference for the *historical* value of our genealogical register, *which* name we regard twice counted by the genealogist.

It is a question, still further, why the genealogist each time desired to have fourteen generations, for the three classes, into which he divided the genealogy of Jesus. The reason for it can be, or has been, supposed to exist: *a*) in the number 14 itself, or, *b*) in its being composed of 2×7 , or, *c*) in the number 42 arising from the multiplication of 3 by 14, or, *d*) in this, that this *same* number (14) is repeated exactly *three* times, or finally, *e*) in this, that the *same* number is repeated in general, in classes determined by other considerations. According to *a*) the number 14, in other respects unimportant, was chosen, because the Hebrew name for David, (דָּוִד) in numerical value was equal to fourteen. We would then have an

instance of the not unfrequent geometrical trifling of the Rabbins, in this case very obscure, and in addition to this, incapable of proof, as far as our evangelist is concerned. The 2d is contrary to the narrative, which does not mention 2×7 , but 14. In the third, Origen, according to his allegorical method of interpretation in the 3×14 generations, in which Christ appeared, finds an allusion to the 42 encampments, by which the people of Israel, in their escape from Egypt, reached the land of promise. The narrative makes mention, neither of encampments, nor of the number 42, but of 3×14 . Under the fourth, it may indeed be said, that the number three is a sacred number, nevertheless, it may be asked, whether in the present instance, it was not selected for reasons arising out of the thing itself. This is *e*) in fact the case. In the history of the line of David, the cotemporary period of the whole Israelitish people was at the same time designed to be given, with which the former was so frequently, and even at the close, allied. Hence the threefold division arose almost out of an internal necessity, which in v. 17, is expressly stated, viz: first period from Abraham to king David, second period from David to the Babylonish captivity, third and concluding period, from the Babylonish captivity to the Messiah Jesus. The two epochs, between the times of Abraham and Jesus, are therefore the reign of David, i. e. the highest prosperity of the kingdom of Israel in general, and then the Babylonish captivity.

In accordance with the idea contained in this division into periods, the "carrying away into Babylon" is mentioned in v. 17, instead of Jehoiachin, and also in v. 11, 12, in the register, and for the same reason, David is the only one who is honored, v. 6, with the appellation of "the king." We could with difficulty find out a division of the Israelitish people into periods, more profound, or more in accordance with the facts. The internal congruity and mutual adaptation is supposed to be pointed out, in accordance with the Hebrew fondness for external and chronological parallelism, by means of the *equal* generations, into which these periods are divided. Inasmuch as the actual state of things corresponded with this in general, but not entirely, *artifice* was obliged to interfere. Those periods, which contained the *fewest* generations, were naturally selected for the basis, because if one with the *most* had been chosen, it would have been necessary to have added originally extraneous generations to the remaining periods, to bring out an equal number. Such a period was that from Abraham to David, which, as the first, at once commended itself. As this

already, according to the Old Testament, contained exactly fourteen generations, the number 14 was thence assumed as a basis. But as both the others, in reality, contained more than fourteen generations, several names were necessarily omitted. This furnishes a very simple explanation, why in the period from David to the Babylonish captivity, when compared with the accounts of the Old Testament, the four names,¹ Ahaziah, Joash, Amaziah and Jehoiakim, were passed over. It was not the result of ignorance, or carelessness, but design, and an expedient knowingly executed. For the same reason, an abbreviation of the genealogy, we are furnished with the most simple explanation, why among the names of the descendants of Zerubbabel, mentioned in Matt. 1: 13 sq., are found none of those in 1 Chron. 3: 19 sq., inasmuch as the lineage of Zerubbabel, in the above mentioned passage of Chronicles, is incomplete, contains only the names of his immediate sons, and his genealogy is then continued through the descendants of one of them, Hananiah. Still we might assume, that the Abiud who is mentioned in Matthew, as son of Zerubbabel, was only another name for one of the sons, Hananiah excepted, given in Chronicles. After a comparison of our genealogical register in Matthew, with the Old Testament narratives, we must therefore conclude that the few discordant statements of the genealogist can be readily explained, by a favorite genealogical custom of the Jews of that time, that his labors in other respects manifest a profound and extensive knowledge of history, and a view entirely in accordance with the facts. About the accuracy of the names in the genealogy, after Zerubbabel, we cannot form any conclusion, with the

¹ It might be asked, whether a more particular reason had also its influence in the exclusion of *these* very four names, perhaps their wickedness, as Lightfoot, Ebrard and others maintain, or whether their omission was altogether accidental, as some four in this list were necessarily to be omitted. When, however, it is maintained by many (De Wette, Fritzsche, Strauss), that the genealogist omitted the three names of Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah, because he, through oversight, had identified the word Ochoziah, the name given to Ahaziah in the Septuagint, with Ozias, of nearly the same sound, the supposition is neither probable in itself, nor is it all necessary, according to the view already given, that he wished to have exactly fourteen generations. A genealogy artificial in an analogous way with ours, is cited by Schoettgen, from Synopsis Sohar p. 132 n. 18. Ab Abrahamo usque ad Salomonem 15 sunt generationes, atque tunc luna fuit in plenilunio. A Salomone usque ad Zedekiam iterum sunt 15 generationes, et tunc luna defecit, et Zedekia effusi sunt oculi: The repetition of the fifteen generations twice, may here be noted. Further information upon the subject of artificial genealogies, may be seen in Lightfoot, but the interpreter, in deciding about ancient genealogies, must not be guided by the genealogical requirements of the present time, but by the wants and customs of *that* people and *that* time to which the genealogies to be explained belong.

aid of the Old Testament, for it is altogether silent about them, nor from any other information preserved elsewhere, than in the gospels.

We proceed now to the consideration of the genealogy of Jesus, in the evangelist Luke, 3: 23-38, for the purpose of examining this first of all separately. The Old Testament parallel extends here from Adam to Nathan, the son of David, v. 31-38. For the descent of Jesus from David is not traced in Luke through Solomon, but Nathan. The persons from Adam to Abraham correspond entirely with Gen. 5: 11: 10 sq., the word Cainan is added, as we have seen, from the Septuagint. The names from Abraham to David are the same as in Matthew. That David had a son named Nathan, appears from 2 Sam. 5: 14; 1 Chron. 3: 5; 14: 4. The subsequent descendants of the house of Nathan are not known to us any further from the Old Testament, but this at least we learn from Zechariah 12: 10-12, that it must have been flourishing and distinguished in later times. Finally it is of decisive importance how the opening sentence of the genealogy, v. 23 is read and connected. However, the words, as far as $\omega\varsigma$ ¹ may be explained, so much is certain, that $\omega\varsigma$ νῦν $\kappa. \tau. \lambda.$ are a more particular explanation of the principal sentence: $\eta\upsilon \omega\sigma\epsilon\iota \epsilon\tau\omega\nu$ $\tau\pi\acute{\alpha}\chi\omicron\nu\tau\alpha$. Which, however, is the correct reading? that of the textus recept: $\omega\varsigma$, $\omega\varsigma$ $\epsilon\iota\sigma\mu\iota\zeta\epsilon\tau\omicron$, νῦν $\iota\omega\sigma\eta\phi$ τοῦ $\text{Ἡλ}\acute{\iota}$ $\kappa. \tau. \lambda.$, which cod. A. favors, or $\omega\varsigma$ νῦν, $\omega\varsigma$ $\epsilon\iota\sigma\mu\iota\zeta\epsilon\tau\omicron$, τοῦ $\text{Ἡλ}\acute{\iota}$ $\kappa. \tau. \lambda.$, which is found in cod. B. and several other codd. *? (v. Schulz and Lachmann). The difference between the two readings consists, on the one hand, in the position of the $\omega\varsigma$ $\epsilon\iota\sigma\mu\iota\zeta\epsilon\tau\omicron$ before or after νῦν, and on the other hand, in the use or omission of the article τοῦ before $\iota\omega\sigma\eta\phi$. We prefer the reading of cod. B. unconditionally. The critic Lachmann, who has weighed the external authorities, has already preceded us in this, in his latest larger edition, whilst in his smaller one, he has retained the reading of the text. recept. We must, however, regard it as an inconsistency, that he has not adopted with it, the article³

¹ Compare my Synopsis, p. 123 sq. Here I defend the reading: $\text{Καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν, ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀρχόμενος, ὡς εἰπὼν ἐπὶ ἀρχαῖα,}$ and in this sense. And he was, namely Jesus, in the commencement, or at first, about thirty years old.

² The reading of several codd: $\omega\varsigma$ $\epsilon\iota\sigma\mu\iota\zeta\epsilon\tau\omicron$ εἶναι νῦν $\iota\omega\sigma\eta\phi$ is in any case a mere emendation.

³ To the authorities for our reading, cited by Dav. Schultz, Julius Africanus, among others, is also from Eusb. I. 7, to be added. The latter cites this passage from Luke, word for word, as follows:

τοῦ before Ἰωσήφ, which is both *externally and internally* connected with it. We may yet remark, that the same cod. B., which we *here* follow, reads also the preceding words, v. 23, correctly, inasmuch as it places ἀρχόμενος before ὡσεὶ ἱσὺν τρεῖς αἰῶνες. (p. 17, n. 2) The following internal evidence may be now already adduced, in favor of the position of the article before Ἰωσήφ. If the article is wanting before Ἰωσήφ, the following τοῦ can naturally be considered *only* as a nearer designation of the word Ἰωσήφ immediately preceding, and in the same way throughout the whole genealogy, so that the τοῦ before θεοῦ, v. 38, can likewise be only a more definite designation of Adam. Now I very much doubt if a monotheist ever said Ἀδάμ ὁ θεοῦ, in the specific sense; Adam, who received his being immediately from God, who was created by God.

The fact that the noun which is in the genitive, is not the name of a man but of God, occasions this difficulty. Were this thought at least to be expressed alone, every one would certainly expect the express addition of υἱός or a similar word. Every one would explain the expression: ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἦν τοῦ θεοῦ, Jesus stood in the most intimate union with God, and not, Jesus was descended from God. The proposed signification of the τοῦ θεοῦ, in this passage, is indeed less forced, because it stands here within a genealogical register. But that the expression remains, notwithstanding, stiff and harsh enough, no unprejudiced person will deny. The only question is whether another easier construction is possible. This is now actually the case, if we consider as genuine the reading τοῦ Ἰωσήφ, which indeed is a reading of equally good authority. For then we will have all genitives, from τοῦ Ἰωσήφ similarly arranged with one another, and can suppose them dependent upon υἱός; inasmuch as he was a son¹ (descendant) of Joseph, Eli. — . . . Adam, God. If, however, to the expression τοῦ θεοῦ, from the preceding υἱός may be supplied, all hesitation is in fact removed. The hitherto not sufficiently valued importance of our readings in the determination of our genealogical question, we will see further, if we in the last place *compare* with each other, the genealogies thus far examined separately.

ὁ δὲ Δουκᾶς ἀνάπαλιν ὅς ἦν (= ὦν) υἱός, ὡς ἐνομίζετο (καὶ γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο προστιθήσεται), τοῦ Ἰωσήφ, τοῦ Ἠλὶ πτλ. He read therefore, likewise the article τοῦ before Ἰωσήφ.

¹ The general sense of υἱός, descendant, is well enough known from the Old and New Testament; yet we may compare e. g. the expressions υἱός Δαυὶδ υἱός Ἀβραάμ, which could not by any possibility be taken in the sense of immediate sonship.

We observe at once, upon a comparison of the two genealogies, that the lineage of Jesus in Matthew, is continued only to Abraham, but in Luke to Adam, and even to God. Of the design of the genealogy in Matthew, he himself informs us, 1: 1. He designs to show in it, that Jesus Christ is the son of David, son of Abraham, i. e. that Christ, with reference to his descent, in accordance with the prophecies of the Old Testament, was the Messiah, and indeed, first of all for the descendants of Abraham, the Jews. In this form of the genealogical table, there is again manifested the fact evident indeed also from other marks, of the preparation of his gospel for Jewish christians. When, on the other hand, Luke proves that Jesus is the son of David, the son of Adam, or of *that* man, from whom all others derive their origin, and in conclusion, of God, he designs to show that Jesus, by virtue of his descent, was the Messiah, and indeed for *all* the children of Adam, in accordance with a plan *fixed* by God himself, in the creation of this Adam. Luke preaches the sentiment of Paul the apostle of the Gentiles, 1 Tim. 2: 4. God will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth. From his genealogical table the *general* character of his gospel is manifest. We see in this point also, that the form of the two registers is most intimately connected with the whole spirit of the gospels in which they are found.

Another point of difference is this, that the register in Matthew is artificially divided into three periods of fourteen generations each, whilst that of Luke shows an uninterrupted succession of names, without any such division. This peculiarity of Matthew may be considered also as more in accordance with Jewish than Grecian taste. Notwithstanding persons think they can discover also in Luke a similar relation of the numbers. If we count, for instance, the names mentioned by him from Jesus inclusive, to God, incl. we obtain seventy-seven, that is, as they accent¹ it, exactly *seven* times eleven gen-

¹ So also Ströbel: A Contribution towards a Scriptural understanding of the genealogies of Jesus, in Dr. Rudelbach and Guerike's Periodical of general Lutheran Theology, 1840, Pt. 3, p. 5. Upon that assumption of the sway of the number seven, he bases indeed, his whole interpretation, one peculiar to himself, alas! that we must add, in the highest degree unfortunate, that Luke, out of regard for the number seven, inserted the five names, which originally did not belong to his genealogy, of God, Cainan (v. 36), Salathiel, Zorobabel and Joseph, of which the last three were borrowed from Matthew. These, inasmuch as they belonged in no wise to the family to be described, were added "for form's sake," or "for the name," views from which one can, in fact, derive no conclusion, and the admissibility of which is refuted by the text itself. To shorten a genealogy, and to increase it by

erations; yet we may, with much greater propriety, consider this number as accidental. For, apart from the fact, that God can with difficulty be considered as of exactly the same line with the other persons, the number seventy-seven is itself, as a round number, of no particular significance, and that it is in this passage divided into eleven separate divisions, there is neither a direct nor an indirect trace in the plan of the register. Persons would hardly ever have come to this conclusion, if the constant comparison of the genealogical register of Matthew with that of Luke had not given occasion to it, though indeed the number seven has, at least, nothing to do with it. Thus far the comparison of the two genealogies occasions no difficulty. The difficulty arising from a comparison of them, consists entirely in this, that the two registers correspond only word for word as far as David, thence however unto Joseph and Jesus seem to separate entirely from each other, inasmuch as the genealogy of Jesus is continued in Matthew, through Solomon and his posterity; in Luke, through Nathan and his descendants, and hence through entirely different persons. How can the genealogy of the *same* individual Jesus from David, differ so much, and yet both be historical records? This is the particular problem of our inquiries for the purpose of harmonizing the genealogical tables, the satisfactory solution of which, has been already prepared in advance by us, as we hope, but which has frequently been impeded, made more difficult, or entirely prevented by the incorporation of questions which did not belong to it, and which needed examination in an earlier connection.

Inasmuch as in Matthew, according to 1: 16, the descent of Joseph is evidently given, and in reference to it only one decision is yet to be made, whether in Luke also, the genealogy of Joseph, or that of Mary is met with—for the descent of Jesus must be continued either through Joseph the father, or through Mary the mother—there are in the solution of that problem only the following cases possible: *first*, as in Matthew, so also in Luke, is given the genealogy of Joseph; *second*, whilst we have the genealogy of Joseph in Matthew, we find that of Mary in Luke. Both possibilities have been actually asserted and maintained. We will examine at once the first supposition, and, in accordance with which we have before us two genealogies of Joseph, especially as this, since

false names, are certainly different things; the former can be supported from many examples among the Hebrews, whilst this latter is unheard of in actual experience, and in the nature of things not to be imagined.

the time of Julius Africanus, until the most recent period, has become almost traditional.

For the documentary examination of the problem, we place below, in a comparative list, the names successively mentioned by Matthew and Luke, from David onwards.

Matthew.	Luke.
1. Solomon.	1. Nathan.
2. Roboam.	2. Mattatha.
3. Abia.	3. Menan.
4. Asa.	4. Melea.
5. Josaphat.	5. Eliakim.
6. Joram.	6. Jonan.
7. Ozias.	7. Joseph.
8. Joatham.	8. Judah.
9. Achaz.	9. Simeon.
10. Ezekias.	10. Levi.
11. Manasses.	11. Matthat.
12. Amon.	12. Jorim.
13. Josiah.	13. Elieser.
14. Jehoiakin.	14. Jose.
Babylonish Captivity.	15. Er.
1. Jehoiakin.	16. Elmodam.
2. Salathiel.	17. Cosam.
3. Zorobabel.	18. Addi.
4. Abiud.	19. Melchi.
5. Eliakim.	20. Neri.
6. Azor.	21. Salathiel.
7. Sadoc.	22. Zorobabel.
8. Achim.	23. Rhesa.
9. Eliud.	24. Joanna.
10. Eleazar.	25. Judah.
11. Matthan.	26. Joseph.
12. Jacob.	27. Semei.
13. Joseph.	28. Mattathias.
14. Jesus.	29. Maath.
	30. Nagge.
	31. Esli.
	32. Naum.
	33. Amos.
	34. Mattathias.
	35. Joseph.
	36. Janna.
	37. Melchi.
	38. Levi.

39. Matthat.

40. Heli.

41. Joseph (*ὡς ἐνομίζετο*).

42. Jesus.

Now, in accordance with the first supposition to be examined, as the genealogy of Joseph is given *as well* by Matthew as by Luke, it would be necessary to explain how Joseph, according to Matthew, could be descended from a different father (Jacob) and then until David or Zorobabel from different ancestors, than those in Luke, according to whom Joseph's father was named Eli, &c. Again, we should be obliged to examine, whether, as is often maintained, the two persons, Salathiel and Zorobabel, mentioned in both lists, are identical or not, and if this is the case, how it happens that their ancestors, as far as David, are entirely different. We will at once examine the first mentioned most important point.

Upon the before mentioned supposition, that the genealogy of Joseph is given in *both* instances, there were two methods made use of for removing the difficulty. Authors rested in the hypothesis of a marriage with a deceased brother's widow, or in that of adoption. Julius Africanus already favors the former hypothesis, in Eusebius (I. 7.) He assumes that Eli, of whom the Jacob mentioned by Matthew was brother, married and died, without leaving any children, that therefore this, his brother Jacob, in accordance with the law in such a contingency, married his surviving widow, for the purpose of extending his brother's line. Deut. 25 : 5-10. From this marriage Joseph, the foster-father of Jesus sprung, who according to the law, was a son of Eli, but by natural descent a son of Jacob. Luke therefore, has followed the legal, Matthew the natural descent of Joseph. It has also, on the other hand, been maintained, which as far as the difficulties are concerned, under which the hypothesis labors, amounts to the same thing, that Matthew follows the legal, and Luke the natural descent, according to which Levi, and not Jacob, is the levir. However, if Jacob and Eli had been natural brothers or cousins, their genealogy should have been united before. The supposition therefore, was made already by Africanus, for the purpose of removing the difficulty, that both were but step-brothers, and indeed by the mother's side, so that their fathers might have belonged to quite different families. In this form the whole hypothesis is already so greatly complicated, that it appears only in a small degree probable. Besides, it is not even established that the step brother, and indeed, which appears to

me, from the spirit of the law, very doubtful, the one by the *mother's* side was obligated to this union. Even were this established, the son of this marriage, Gen. 25 : 6, could be named only in the legal genealogy. For the purpose of explaining how he could also be taken into the natural genealogy, we would finally be obliged still to assume, that the genealogist who offers the latter, was either himself not acquainted with this marriage, or passes by its legal significance. Much simpler is the hypothesis of adoption. Was Joseph adopted either by Jacob or Eli, his natural and legal genealogy could very readily appear in an entirely different form, and only this would again occasion difficulty, that Joseph was taken into *both* genealogies. From want of a better explanation, we would be obliged to hold on to this hypothesis, if we were notwithstanding satisfied from overpowering arguments, of the historical character of our genealogies. We proceed now to those who maintain, that in Luke the genealogy of *Mary*, and not of Joseph, is given. This is at once apparent, that by this supposition, at present not unfrequently presented, without any hypothesis, all inconsistency between Matthew and Luke is removed by *one* blow, for the genealogy of Jesus through Joseph, *must* indeed in fact have been different from that through Mary. The question, therefore, only is, whether the text in Luke permits, or altogether demands this supposition.

Usually it is said, that τοῦ before ἡλίου, is to be taken in the sense of step-son : Jesus was a son, as was supposed, of Joseph, who was a step-son of Eli, who was a son of Matthat, who was a son of Levi, &c. Then Eli would have been actually the father of Mary, and in Luke the genealogy of the latter would be given. Now a more accurate acquaintance with grammatical construction has long ago shown, that the article with the genitive of a proper name, which is appended to another proper name, must not be completed by understanding, as the earlier empirical grammarians supposed, the word *vios*, &c., that in fact there is nothing to be *supplied*, but that every thing is contained in the idea of the genitive connected with the article ; that the formula or expression, however, designates an intimate connection and mutual relationship of two persons, which may be of a nearer or more remote nature, and hence the relation of a friend, e. g. in the well known Eusebii Pamphili ; usually, however, the *nearest* condition of relationship either that of a son or child, is expressed by it. It can, therefore, not admit of doubt, that the τοῦ ἡλίου, of itself, can denote the relation of a step-son ; yet whilst this explana-

tion of the expression, even in general, is somewhat far-fetched, it is positively excluded by the immediate connection. It is impossible that in a *genealogical register*, in which, in accordance with its nature, purely actual or legal ancestors must be presented, that the mere relation of *affinity* could be made available; and in the highest degree improbable that the $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ was to be explained over seventy times of a proper filial relationship, whilst in *one* case it should be used in the sense of a step-son. From the *immediate* connection of the $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ with the Ἰωσὴφ standing before it, it is necessary, if indeed the genealogy of Mary is to be given, to have recourse to an hypothesis, by which the step-son Joseph, at the same time, would be the legal son of Eli; for then this $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ also could be explained as those following. Thus originated the hypothesis defended by Epiphanius, Olshausen and others, that Mary was a so-called inheriting daughter, that is, without a brother, whose husband, according to the law, Numb. 36 : 6, Neh. 7 : 63, cf. Ez. 2 : 61, was obliged to be of the same family, or have his name inserted in their family register. A very ingenious supposition—yet apart from the fact, that the competency of Mary to occupy this relation, at least cannot be shown, and we besides do not know whether the law of the inheriting daughter was maintained unimpaired until the time of Jesus, it would still strike us as singular, that the same Joseph appears in the genealogy of Matthew, whilst *this* evangelist, if he knew of it, would have certainly first observed this Jewish custom. Yet fortunately for us, this whole hypothesis is superfluous, as we have already (p. 382) seen that the $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ before Ηλὶ , is not a more definite *explanation* of Joseph, but that the genitive $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ Ἡλὶ depends *immediately* upon $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$, and therefore is similarly situated with $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ Ἰωσὴφ .

The correctness of this explanation, and at the same time, the necessity of the supposition, that Luke intended to give the genealogy of Mary, will appear further, if we now endeavor to ascertain more accurately, the meaning of the $\omega\varsigma$ ἐνομήζετο . That this addition is, according to the codd., to be read *after* the $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$, we have seen in p. 381. Before $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$, it would, in fact, yield no sense. For syntactically, it would necessarily have reference to the *whole* genealogy, and therefore assert, that this could only be referred to Jesus in accordance with the *views of the people*, and indeed *erroneously*. To present a genealogy as legitimate, in the same connection in which it is *expressly* asserted to be only *erroneously considered* as such, would be an error in calculo beyond all precedent. Authors cannot appeal to the genealogy in Matthew, for the purpose of showing

that such absurdities are not foreign to the evangelists, inasmuch as here the genealogy of Joseph is presented, and yet in v. 16 it is added, that Jesus was not the son of Joseph, but of Mary. For the explanation follows immediately afterwards, why the genealogy of Joseph could here be given: Matt. 1: 24, 25, because Joseph truly recognized Jesus as his legal son. Had Luke designed giving also the legal genealogy of Jesus, he would have used, instead of *ὡς ἐνομίζετο*, i. e. *ut putabatur*, *existimabatur*, another mode of expression; perhaps *ὡς κατὰ νόμον υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ* κτλ. But if we reject now the position of the *ὡς ἐνομίζετο*, before *υἱὸς*, from internal evidence, and adopt the other well attested reading *υἱὸς ὡς ἐνομίζετο*, every impartial reader will refer, partly for the above mentioned logical reason, partly because he has before learned from the first two chapters of the same gospel of Luke, that Jesus was in fact not the son of Joseph, but of Mary, the expression *ὡς ἐνομίζετο* only to the one, and indeed the first name of the genealogy, *τοῦ Ἰωσήφ*. Luke intends to say: Whilst he (Jesus) was a son, as was supposed, of Joseph, (in fact however of Mary) of Eli, &c. He might have placed instead of *ὡς ἐνομίζετο*, *τοῦ Ἰωσήφ* also *τῆς Μαρίας*, preferred, however, *expressly* to oppose the generally received opinion, that he was the actual son of Joseph. With this construction of the verse the conclusion is necessarily connected—that *Luke presents the genealogy of Mary, and Eli is to be considered the father of Mary*. We desire in what follows, to defend this decisive answer to our question against possible objections, and support it by some additional arguments.—Of the difficulties which have been mentioned, this one has properly not yet been explained, that no account was taken of the female line in Jewish genealogies. That this was not usually the case is true.¹ But that the family of the mother was never and nowhere given, is indeed false.² A necessary exception is found to this rule in the present case, in which the person whose genealogy is to be given, Jesus, in accordance with the admission, had, in general, no human father. That descent from David, and generation without a father, at least in Luke's view, do not contradict each other, appears from his own gospel: Luke 1: 32; cf. v. 35.

¹ Bava batra fol. 110. a: genus patris vocatur genus, genus matris non vocatur genus; cf. Lightfoot upon Matt. 1: 16.

² Bereschit R. 30: ego assurrexi ei, qui ipse de Juda, ego vero de Benjamin; et ipse ex masculis Juda, ego vero ex feminis. Also compare life of the cotemporary Josephus, §. 1. Moreover, I belong to the royal line, by my mother.

After the solution of this difficulty, we proceed to the other reasons which favor the fact that Luke wishes to give the genealogy of Mary. 1) As soon as we meet with two different genealogies of one and the same person, we at once, if there is not in advance a decisive suspicion of their being unhistorical in character, have recourse to the supposition that this difference is to be explained in this way, that the one is the genealogy of the father, the other of the mother. As now the genealogy in Matthew is indubitably that of Joseph, as legal father, so will the one in Luke readily be that of his mother Mary. 2) As son of Joseph, Jesus was the son of David *de jure*, as son of Mary, he was the same *secundum naturam*. Therefore, not only *de jure*, but also *secundum naturam*, Jesus belonged to the seed of David, to which the promise was given. Indeed, the selection made between the two possible genealogies of Jesus, by our evangelists, is most intimately connected with the spirit and character of their gospels. Matthew has prepared, as we have seen, his genealogy to suit the wants of his readers, not only in other respects, in accordance with Jewish views, but has also done the same in this, that he proves the descent of Jesus from David from the line of his legal father, because the family of the *father* in the Jewish genealogies was most regarded. But as the anti-Jewish intention of the genealogy of Luke shows itself, not only by the absence of the above-mentioned marks, but also expressly by the existence of evidences of an opposing character, so likewise in this, that the descent of Jesus from David is presented in the natural way, through his *mother* Mary. In entire harmony with these views is the fact, that the father of Jesus, Joseph, in the history of the childhood in *Luke*, in contrast with Mary his mother, is strikingly put in the background, whilst in Matthew, he is made prominent. 3) In accordance with all the indirect evidence, Mary is in Luke, even apart from her genealogy, represented as belonging to the family of David. This appears to follow indirectly already from Luke 2: 4, 5. It is true, Strauss uses this passage as the strongest argument *against* the descent of Mary from David. He says in the second edition of his life of Jesus (Vol. I. p. 165) "chiefly however, the turn given to the passage, Luke 2: 4; ἀνὴρ δὲ καὶ Ἰωσήφ — διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐξ οἴκου καὶ πατρὸς Δαυὶδ, ἀνυπόστατοι οὖν Μαρία κατὰ, where in place of αὐτὸν αὐτοῖς could so readily have been placed, if the author had a thought of the descent of Mary also from David, decides against the possibility of referring the genealogy from David, found in the third evangelist to Mary." Notwithstanding it is easily seen, that αὐτοῖς could not be used

here at all, in place of *αὐτόν*. The syntactical connection in Luke must have been quite a different one. Instead of *ἀνίστη δὲ καὶ Ἰωσήφ*, he would have been obliged to say *ἀνίσταται δὲ καὶ Ἰωσήφ καὶ Μαρία*. Whilst now from the *αὐτόν* there can be no conclusion derived, we believe that we can derive the descent of Mary from David from that verse in the following way. The census of that time was held according to families; and in Bethlehem only, those descended from David had to present themselves, Luke 2: 4. As now Mary went to Bethlehem, and as the wife, in accordance with the regulations of the foreign census, was obliged¹ to appear independently of her husband, she would have been of the line of David. More decisive is, however, Luke 1: 27. cf. 1: 69. It is a question, with what *ἐξ οὗ* here is to be construed, with *ἀνδρὶ ὡνόμα Ἰωσήφ*, or with the *πατρίον* preceding. Strauss and others favor the reference to *ἀνδρὶ, ὡνόμα Ἰωσήφ*, because this is the noun standing nearest to it. But the reference to *πατρίον* is also syntactically possible,² and as far as the thought is concerned, it is in fact in closer connection with the latter than the former.

From the nature of the history of the childhood of Jesus in Luke, it must have been a matter of more concern to the author, to give an account of the descent of the chief person in it, Mary, than of that of Joseph. This holds true in particular, also of the fact containing the annunciation to Mary, which is introduced in exactly the same words: Luke 1: 26, 27. And how can it be thought, that he who gives an account of the family of Elizabeth (Luke 1: 5) should have failed to give that of *Mary*. Quite decisive, however, may Luke 1: 32, cf. v. 35, be considered. In the verse first mentioned, *David* is directly called the *father* of Jesus, and yet in v. 35, his immediate origin from God is substituted for this human relation. This can be made to harmonize with the connection in which it is found in the gospel of Luke, in no other way than thus, that Jesus, according to him, was connected with the line of David, through his mother. 4) Tradition also speaks, in general, in favor of the descent of Mary from David. Even Strauss (Vol. I. p. 162) admits this: "The opinion of the descent of Mary from David became, however, soon (!) more common." He then quotes the well known

¹ See my Synopsis, p. 103.

² This connection has been already indicated by the punctuation selected by the philologist Lachmann: *πρὸς πατρίον ἐμνηστευμένην ἀνδρὶ, ὡνόμα Ἰωσήφ, ἐξ οὗ Δαυὶδ, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τῆς πατρίου Μαρίας*.

passages from the apocryphal writings Protevang. Jacobi c. 1 and 10. and Evang. de nativitate Mariæ c. 1, according to which, the persons Joachim and Anna, who are represented as the parents of Jesus, are said to have been descended from David, and also Justin the Martyr (dialog. c. Tryph. 43, 100), according to whom the virgin descended from the family of David, Jacob, Isaac and Abraham. Especially from partiality for an erroneous opinion, that of finding, even in the descent of Jesus, his priestly and kingly significance, the statement originated, that Jesus sprung from a mixed family of the tribes of Judah and *Levi*, (Testament. Simeon c. 71), still defended by some moderns, in consequence of the expression in Luke 1: 36, which is not conclusive, that Mary was a *relation*, (*συγγενής*) of Elizabeth, who (Luke 1: 5) was a daughter of Aaron. On the contrary, the Jewish tradition¹ also maintained that the *Eli* mentioned by Luke was the father of Mary. We hope that we have satisfactorily proved, that Luke does not give the genealogy of Joseph, but that of Mary, who, however, likewise had her descent from the family of David. It is then, entirely a matter of course, that the genealogies of Matthew and Luke, on the one hand, are not identical, and yet, on the other hand, even before David, again become united. The subject assumes a somewhat different aspect, if, as is maintained, Salathiel and Zorobabel, in Matthew and Luke are the same persons. Then it would be necessary still to show, how the two genealogies immediately after him, could separate, and yet become united in David. This also seems to favor their identity, that the Salathiel of Luke is about as many names distant from David, as the Salathiel of Matthew: for the former is reckoned from David, the twenty-first person, this one the fifteenth, and therefore, if we include the four generations purposely omitted, the nineteenth. The problem therefore to be solved, would be this, that in two different genealogies of nearly the same period, and indeed that about the time of the captivity, two persons with the name of Salathiel appear, of whom each has a son called Zorobabel. Upon the supposition of their being the same person, the hypothesis of a deceased brother's widow or that of adoption, was repeated with all its inconveniences; which, however, was still better, and more tolerable, than when modern criticism, on account of that unintelligible identity, maintains a consequent unhistorical character of the genealogies. But that supposed identity does not stand, by any means, upon a sure basis. What is

¹ Cf. Lightfoot upon Luke 3: 23.

there remarkable in this,¹ that in two, and besides kindred lines, even supposing the time the same, two persons of the same name follow one another? In the unusual form of these names, surely there can be nothing remarkable, and even this might be lessened by an analysis of them. There were, we may say, nearly about the same time, two Salathiels, that is, if we wish for illustration to put in place of this, a name customary with us, two Theodores or Gotthilfs: this is doubtless frequent enough. Each of these had a son, who received the surname Zorobabel, i. e. begotten in Babylon (זְרֹבָבֶל). But this surname was very natural, inasmuch as they were, as we know, born during the *Babylonish Captivity*. The two Salathiels and Zorobabels might be, as far as the name is concerned, certainly identical. But Matthew and Luke name at the same time, their ancestors and descendants, and they are each time entirely different; according to Matthew, they belong to the house of Solomon; according to Luke, that of Nathan; therefore, they cannot possibly be identical. Such a confusion of names, as modern criticism supposes, is only in this case allowable, if, on the one hand, we know in advance, that our genealogies are also, in other respects, entirely unhistorical, of which, however, we have seen the very opposite, and if we suppose Luke, on the other hand, to have had such an imperfect acquaintance with the *Old Testament*, that he could attach his Salathiel and Zorobabel to the house of Nathan, whilst they, in fact, as he must have learned from the well known passages of the Old Testament, belonged to the house of David through Solomon. The older critics, as Julius Africanus and others, have without any exception, considered them different individuals. Strauss speaks on the contrary (Vol. I. p. 164) as follows: "In consequence of the celebrity of Zorobabel, son of Salathiel, at the time of the captivity, it is scarcely to be believed, that Luke did not mean him by this designation." Luke indeed, who himself, as we have seen, clearly enough shows the opposite! A really marvellous consequence of this canon of celebrity is it, when Bruno Bauer identifies the four successive names of Levi, Simeon, Judah and Joseph (Luke 3: 29, 30) with the well known sons of Jacob, and Amos and Nahum (v. 25) with the well known prophets, and now from this certainly very plausible combination, draws conclusions as to the historical character of our genealogy. This is called *historical criticism*.

¹ Cf. Paulus exeget. Handbuch, I Part p. 282 sq.

We present now the result of our investigation. Both genealogies, that of Matthew to Zorobabel, and that of Luke to Nathan, manifest an accurate acquaintance with, and careful use of, the accounts of the Old Testament: All independent sources of information as to the names, after this period, are indeed at present wanting; yet their constant dissimilarity from that point onwards, testifies in favor of the *opinion* deduced so readily from the passages themselves, and the whole connection of the corresponding gospels, that Matthew gives the genealogy of Joseph, the legal father of Jesus, and Luke that of his mother Mary. Whilst therefore, there is no collision in their separate statements, but, on the other hand, even in the details, the most varied traces of their authenticity, the *general* considerations stated at the commencement of the article have the greater force, in accordance with which, we were authorized to expect an historically certified representation of the genealogy of Jesus, and least of all, such an one as could have been fabricated for the first time within the *christian church*, out of legends intelligently or ignorantly narrated.

ARTICLE III.

NOTES ON PROPHECY.

Daniel—Seventh Chapter.

The Kingdom spoken of in verse fourteen, &c.

(Continued.)

By Rev. J. Oswald, A. M., York, Pa.

2. *Who shall set up, or establish this kingdom?* Nebuchadnezzar set up the first in the succession of governments noticed in this chapter. This is correct, and sufficient, so far as these notes are concerned. We cannot here enter minutely into the acts of his father, who secured Babylon's independence, with respect to Nineveh or the Assyrians; nor have we here ought to do with the mutual relations and wars, &c., of Babylon and Assyria, during a long succession of centuries preceding. But to resume, Nebuchadnezzar was an idolater and persecutor, at least in the earlier periods of his reign. His government partaking of his character, was idolatrous and per-

secuting also, and hence, and for this reason, a *beast* was its emblem. Darius, or perhaps rather Cyrus, established the second. A *beast* symbolized it also, and for the same reason as the preceding, because it was idolatrous and persecuting. At all events, Zion was in captivity to it, and Israel, or the church, humanly speaking, near destruction, and only saved from annihilation, by the gracious and marvellous interposition of heaven. Alexander originated the third. A *beast* was its symbol. He breathed threatening and slaughter against the church, or which amounts to the same thing, against the people, who then constituted it, and who were only preserved from the wrath of this idolatrous and furious king, by the overruling hand, or wonderful and wonderworking providence of God. Romulus, &c., laid the foundation of the fourth monarchy, and a succession and combination of wicked, carnal, Christless men, the fourth in the phase, which it has presented, these many centuries, and *infidelity* will give it its last development, when it will stand forth revealed "that man of sin," the "son of perdition," whom the Lord "shall destroy with the brightness of his coming:" 2 Thes. 2. But the kingdom which succeeds to this last, the God of heaven shall set up, and it shall never be destroyed.—Dan. 2: 44.

There is a great difference, then, in the origin of these kingdoms. Creatures sinful and imperfect, by permission, originated the first four, but this last, has the God of heaven for its author. The God of heaven is the Infinite, the self-existent, eternal, immutable, omnipotent and independent; the omnipresent, omniscient, holy, just, merciful, benevolent and good; the only wise living and true God, who alone hath immortality, and to whom be glory and dominion forever. How different must not be his work, from that of man; his kingdom, from mere human governments! Every perfection is his. He is the creator of all, of the heavens and of the earth. Our bodies are his workmanship. Our spirits are his creation. He formed the archangel, and made the creeping thing; the worm and the seraph. He is the universal benefactor. In his smile the highest intelligencies are enraptured. On his bounty the insect lives. He governs all. The clouds are his chariot. He rides upon the wings of the wind. He holds the wave in the hollow of his hand. Thunders wait his pleasure. Tempests serve him. The fiery flames obey him. Nothing transpires in his boundless dominions, nor yet *can* happen, without his knowledge, permission and control. Does an atom change position, he gives it motion. Is a blade of grass matured, he gives it perfection. Does a ray of light pass through space, he

directs it. Does a world apostatize, or do angels fall, his overruling hand is there. He "breathes in every wind; thunders in every storm; wings the lightning; pours the streams and rivers, empties the volcano; heaves the ocean; and shakes the globe. Nevertheless, the God of heaven, without whom, and independent of whom, as we have seen, not any thing *can* transpire, yet has *permitted* many things, in the moral universe especially, which are opposed, or contrary to his pleasure. By an exertion of his power which knows no limit, he might have hindered them. He did not, *and wherefore not*, is one of the secret things, which belong unto God. But of this one thing, we may ever be sure; that the great design of God in all things is, to do good, boundlessly and forever, and to disclose himself, as the boundless and eternal good. He permitted angels to fall. He permitted Satan to enter Eden's blessed bowers, and tempt our first parents. He permitted the apostacy of Adam and Eve. He has permitted earth to be, morally, a lazar-house of corruption, for near six thousand years. Though the field, from which have been gathered the trophies of God's marvelous grace, yet on it, (viz: earth) men have blasphemed the great and glorious name of the Lord their God. On it, impurity, drunkenness, treachery, fraud, violence and murder, have run riot. On it, the fiend of war has waded through human blood, trampled on human corpses, in every age, and in every land, emptying earth, and filling hell. On it, idolatry has flourished. Instead of worshipping Jehovah, men have worshiped devils, beasts, vegetables, each other, gods molten of silver and gold, and idols hewn out of wood and stone. And finally, God has permitted a succession of governments on earth, freely chosen by wicked man, but he reserved to himself the right to overturn, and overturn, one after the other, and when he shall have annihilated the last, then, as we have seen, he will himself set up a kingdom.

The positive declaration, Dan. 2: 44, already referred to, or quoted, might suffice, but that we may be more fully certified, as to the origin of this kingdom, let us follow our prophet somewhat more minutely, through several verses of this (7th) chapter. "I beheld till the thrones were cast down," (v. 9.) i. e. the prophet in vision looked on, until he saw the thrones of the beasts, or the idolatrous persecuting governments overthrown. "And the Ancient of days did sit," (v. 9.) God the Father is so denominated in this place. He sat in judgment, especially on the last of these powers. His appearance was venerable and majestic. His "garment *was* white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool; his throne *was*

like the fiery flame, and his wheels as the burning fire," (v. 9). "A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him: thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him" (v. 10). These were all ministering spirits, angels who waited to do his pleasure, whether of judgment or of mercy. It is his glory to be thus attended, numerous and cheerfully; and it is his glory to be dependant on, to need none of these, to be absolutely independent of all. "The judgment was set, and the books were opened," (v. 10) i. e. the judgment of the last beast, or rather of the "little horn," whose rise, speech and acts, fill so large a space in this chapter. "I beheld then, because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake: I beheld *even* till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame. As concerning the rest of the beasts, they had their dominion taken away: yet their lives were prolonged for a season and a time,"—v. 11, 12. When the dominion was taken away from the rest of the *beasts*, says Bishop Newton, their *bodies* were not destroyed, but suffered to continue still in being," but when the dominion shall be taken away from *this beast*, his *body* shall be totally destroyed; because *other kingdoms* succeeded to those, but none other earthly kingdom shall succeed to this. "I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of man," i. e. our Lord Jesus Christ, "came with the clouds of heaven," v. 13. Christ is thus to come—Acts 1: 11; Rev. 1: 7. The prophet saw him come to the Ancient of Days, and brought near before him, (v. 13) "and there was given unto him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom *that* which shall not be destroyed," v. 14. On the words of this verse, "his dominion is an everlasting dominion," A. Clarke has this comment: "christianity shall increase, and prevail, to the end of the world"!!! *This everlasting dominion, will only be given, when Christ comes with the clouds of heaven.* But he will only thus come, at the end of the world; at the final day, at the day of universal judgment. How puerile then, such interpretations of prophecy; yet how many equally absurd, are eagerly embraced, and strenuously advocated, whilst the true intent of the sacred record is wholly misapprehended, disregarded, and, in effect rejected!

Our object, viz: to show the origin of the kingdom which is to *succeed*, the governments symbolized by beasts and horns, being accomplished; it may not be amiss, after contemplating

so much that is melancholy, to note some of the characteristics or peculiarities of this kingdom, whose *establishment* is not by permission only, or of the will of man, but a direct act of heaven.

In this kingdom there will be no war, to spread wide the miseries of dismay, plunder, slaughter and devastation. Then will the prophet's prediction, in reference to earth's inhabitants be literally and gloriously fulfilled; "neither shall they learn war any more," Isa. 2: 4.¹ In it, there will be no more marshaling of nations, of hostile hosts for mutual destruction. No marching armies, whose track is marked by desolated lands, smoking villages, ruined cities, mangled corpses, and new-made and scarcely covered graves, attracting the hyena, the vulture and the wolf.

In this kingdom, "the inhabitant shall not say, I am sick," Isa. 33: 24. The pestilence which walketh in darkness, and which wasteth at noonday, will be no more. Death (physical) will, ere its establishment, have removed his last subject, and the grave swallowed up its last victim. In it everything will *live*, and not only live, but grow, and flourish, and bloom without interruption. Immortality will light up every eye. Immortality will beam from every countenance. Life vernal and immortal, will be the delightful heritage of all the children of the kingdom.

In this kingdom, there will be no more selfishness. Every individual will fully realize the import of the Savior's declaration, "it is more blessed to give than to receive." Under this influence, all hearts, and all hands, all the mighty faculties and unwearied efforts of all its citizens, will be completely and eternally occupied, in doing good.

In this kingdom, there will "be no more curse," Rev. 22: 3. There will be no sin committed by any of its subjects, to occasion a curse, and consequently no wrath in God. Once he was offended with them, on account of sin. But in the day of their merciful visitation, they confessed their sins, and they found him faithful and just, to forgive their sins, and to cleanse them from all unrighteousness, through the mediation and merits of the Redeemer. Perfectly and eternally secure they will all be, against every degree of separation from God. On

¹ Those who maintain the spiritual reign of Christ during the Millenium, as those also, who advocate his personal reign, during one thousand years, teach that at the termination of that happy period, there will be a great apostasy, or falling away from Christ, and a marshaling of hostile armies, &c. These commonly received opinions of the Millenium, must then be unscriptural, and ought to be abandoned, for in the face of, or in direct opposition to, the divine record, they teach, *that the people will learn war again.*

earth, i. e. in the present state, the heirs of the kingdom, sometimes complain with Job, "Behold I go forward but he is not there, and backward but I cannot perceive him. On the left hand where he doth work, but I cannot behold him: he hideth himself on the right hand, that I cannot see him." But in the kingdom; in the New Jerusalem, its metropolis, God "will dwell with them," (Rev. 21: 3) and they will enjoy his presence forever.

In this kingdom, finally, there shall be no night. No natural night, such as we experience when the sun is absent, in which the afflicted count the long hours of darkness, and sigh for the returning light; in which thieves break through and steal, and in which revellers are drunken. There will be no spiritual night, such as now broods over the unevangelized nations, such as now envelops the unregenerate soul. No ignorance. No error. No night of affliction, temptation, oppression, desertion and sorrow. The eternal night will not cast its dark and deadly shadow on any portion of this bright land. The blackness of darkness is peculiar to the bottomless pit. The blackness of darkness forever, has no relation, or reference at all, to the saints. It is the portion of the final enemies of the Most High, of the rejecters of Christ, of those who resist the Holy Ghost, of all the contemners of God's marvelous grace.

The kingdoms which preceded *this*, were distracted often. Melancholy, stormy, bloody governments were they. Oppression, carnage, devastation and decay, characterized them. They were comparatively Bedlams, in which chains clanked, in concert to chains, and to rage and blasphemy. Crimes haunted them. Fiends in human form filled them. But in the kingdom which is to come, which the God of heaven will set up, all will in the most exact sense, love the Lord their God, with all their heart, and with all their soul, and with all their strength, and with all their understanding, and they will love each other as themselves. The ransomed of all nations, will be one bright sparkling jewel, reflecting only, and always the image of Christ. Sin will be banished forever. The last tear wiped away from every eye, by the divine hand. The "tabernacle of God" shall be with men. This kingdom will never be invaded by any disturbing principle, nor the harmony of its citizens interrupted. Peace, divine and eternal, will breathe her balmy influence over every spirit. The voice of contention will be hushed. There will be "no more sea."

Confusion and noise, and garments rolled in blood, shall be no more.

3. *When will this kingdom be set up?* It will be established when the last of the governments, represented by beasts and horns, in this chapter, shall have passed away: when the very last of them (the Anti-Christ), is slain, and his body destroyed and given to the burning flame, v. 11. The *gentile* governments must all be swept away, as the chaff of the summer threshing-floor, and no place be found for them, (Dan. 2: 35) ere the glorious things spoken of Zion, shall all be accomplished. The seventh, or last trumpet must sound, before the great voices in heaven are heard, saying, "the kingdoms of this world are become *the kingdoms* of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign forever and ever," and in consequence of which, the four and twenty elders fall upon their faces and worship God, "saying, we give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, and art to come; because thou hast taken to thee thy great power, and hast reigned,"—Rev. 11. At this era, there will be wailings among the kindreds of the earth, and dismay among the kings, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman and every freeman, and the nations will be angry, and there will be blood, and war (just preceding the setting up of this kingdom), such as there was none since men were on earth, and slaughter, and carnage, altogether unparalleled in the annals of time. But there will also be rejoicings, and raptures, and transports such as the world never witnessed, and gratulations, and songs of triumph, such as were never heard, for when the Lord God Almighty's wrath comes, and he destroys "them which destroy the earth," then also will be the time for giving reward to his servants the prophets, and to the saints, and to them that fear his name, small and great, Rev. 11: 18. This reward, (the occasion of joy so great) we need not say, will be worthy of the giver, rich, full, bright as heaven, and enduring as eternity.

For the sake of being perspicuous, we must again state in a few words, what has already been written in preceding notes, viz: that the church existed contemporaneously, with all the gentile governments, but the kingdom, which the God of heaven shall set up, (Dan. 2: 44) and which shall never be destroyed, will *succeed* them. Except the last, *all* these governments have "their dominion taken away," v. 12. The "little horn," or Papal power, still exists, but with destruction seemingly not very remote. Its great, but brief antichristian development, is also yet future, when it will manifest itself, as

"him whose coming is after the working of satan, with all power, and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness, in them that perish, because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved,"—2 Thes. 2: 9, 10. The world's history, illustrated by prophecy, becomes a *subject of exultation in our day*, for all those who long, and sigh, and wait for the coming of the kingdom of God. So great a part of "the times of the gentiles," having elapsed, when we ask *what of the night?* we take encouragement from the conviction, that *the noon of night has long since passed*. Our fathers in ages remote, sat in the midst of the darkness, we their children, may with transport say, *the morning cometh*.

This kingdom will be set up, when Christ shall have descended from the mediatorial throne; consequently, when the last of our race, that is to be, shall have been born into the church, or added to the number of those who shall be saved. When all of mankind shall have existed, that God originally purposed, should exist, then, (not before) will be the kingdom. When sin shall have done its utmost and its worst; when virtue shall have suffered enough; when through grace, the glorious register of immortality, contained in the Lamb's book of life, shall have been written out to the last line," then shall be the full development, the perfection, the *kingdom*, of which the church, in all ages, and under all dispensations, contained the rudiments, the *first principles*, the *germ*.

This kingdom will be set up, when "one like the son of man" (v. 13) shall come with the clouds of heaven. The reference here is, unquestionably, to our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. Equally certain is it, that the allusion is to his *second* advent, and not to the first. The *manner* of his coming, unmistakeably designates *which* coming is intended. The first (though not without its wonderful and glorious concomitants, such as were vouchsafed at the birth of no mere human being; the announcing angel, the heavenly host, the guiding star, the worshiping magi,) was without external pomp or circumstance. The second, is to be with the clouds of heaven, Acts 1: 7. At the appearing of the Lord Jesus Christ, he will judge the quick and the dead, and at his appearing and judgment, will be his kingdom,—2 Tim. 4: 1. "And there was given unto him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed," v. 14. This the prophet saw, in the night visions,

and *this* is abundantly promised elsewhere, in the sacred volume, viz: that Christ shall receive a kingdom:—2 Sam. 7: 16; Ezek. 21: 25, 26, 27; Acts 2: 30; Luke 3: 23.

God promised that the house or kingdom and throne of David, should be *established forever*. Nothing could be more explicit. "And thy throne and thy kingdom shall be established forever," 2 Sam. 7: 16. But in the progress of time, to say nothing of the defection of the ten tribes under Jeroboam, the lineal descendants of David, ceased to occupy the throne of Judah, and to reign in Jerusalem, or indeed, any where else. In Zedekiah this *termination* of David's dynasty took place, who in the eleventh year of his reign, was carried into captivity, when Nebuchadnezzar took Jerusalem, and destroyed both city and temple. In reference to this last reigning prince of David's line, the Lord God spake thus, by the mouth of his prophet: "And thou, profane wicked prince of Israel, whose day is come, when iniquity *shall have* an end, thus saith the Lord God; remove the diadem, and take off the crown: This *shall* not be the same: exalt *him that is low*, and abase *him that is high*. I will overturn, overturn, overturn it: and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is; and I will give it *him*," Ezek. 21: 25, 26, 27. Now who has a right to the crown, and to whom shall it be given? Inasmuch as the omnipotent, the just and righteous God, has it in his own hands, and at his disposal, the crown will not be given to any without the proper title, but this no one can have, except he be of David's house. "The Lord hath sworn in truth unto David, he will not turn from it, of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy throne," Psalm 132: 11. The apostle Peter, on the day of Pentecost, preaching to the congregated multitude, applied this scripture to Jesus Christ, and he could not have erred, or been mistaken, inasmuch as he spake under the influence of the Holy Ghost. Speaking of David, he said, "Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne," Acts 2: 30. Christ then, who according to the flesh is the son of David, unquestionably is he who has the right to the crown, to the throne and to the kingdom, which David's descendants forfeited and lost, by reason of their iniquities, and to him, and not to *another*, shall the throne be given. In him, David's throne and kingdom shall be established forever. "He shall be great," said the angel to Mary, "he shall be great, and shall be called the son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he

shall reign over the house of Jacob forever ; and of his kingdom there shall be no end," Luke 1 : 32, 33. All believers, I apprehend, admit this, but confounding the church with the kingdom, maintain that its fulfilment dates from the first advent of the Son of God, or from the establishment of the church on earth. But where is this written ? To the law and to the testimony. If our faith and opinions be not founded on the word of God, they are worth just nothing ; they are wood, hay and stubble, whose destiny it is to be burned. I assert then, (and from the inspired record it may, I imagine, not be successfully contradicted) that Christ did not set up his kingdom before his *first* advent. That he was God from the beginning, and so the first cause, the creator, the ruler, the king *over all creatures and all worlds*, that is quite another question, and has no reference to the subject under consideration. But to proceed, Christ did not set up his kingdom when he commenced his ministry. He proclaimed it as near at hand, but not as established. He did not set it up at anytime *during* his indefatigable and glorious ministry, or previous to his passion. His disciples, in common with their countrymen and nation, were full of the notion of a temporal kingdom, under the Messiah, but he gave no countenance to it. The men who had witnessed the astonishing miracle of feeding five thousand, with a few loaves, &c., were ready to take him by force, and make him king, but he escaped from them and departed into a mountain alone, John 6. And finally, he did not set up this kingdom, after his resurrection. His disciples pointedly asked him the question, "saying, Lord wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel," Acts 1 : 6. But he gratified not their curiosity, but answered them, "it is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the father hath put in his own power," Acts 1 : 7. Two things are worthy of note in this answer, in this connection. 1st. The Savior did not say that there was no kingdom at all to be established, and which is to be given to Israel, which I apprehend he would now have done, if the idea had been a baseless Hebrew notion ; a mere Jewish figment. He, in his answer to his disciples, left the *idea* of the kingdom stand as a *great truth*, and that it is to be *given* to Israel, though not to Israel in the sense the disciples *may* have understood and used the term. 2d. If the time had then been for the setting up, or establishment of this kingdom, we can imagine no sufficient reason, why he should not have told them plainly ; the evasiveness of his answer is, under the circumstances, a proof of its non-establishment *then*, or at that time. But beyond all this, he soon after

departed ; left his disciples, as respected his visible bodily presence, and went away to come again, and at his *second* coming, will the vision in v. 14 be fulfilled, and all similar prophecies have their accomplishment. The final judgment will not be before the second coming of our Lord. He will then judge the quick and the dead ; dispose of both the righteous and the wicked. At his command, heaven will open to his saints in that day, and the doors of hell close on its odious, guilty and miserable inhabitants forever. But as the final judgment will not be *before* the advent of the Judge, so this kingdom, of which we are speaking, will not be before the judgment. In a word, the *appearing* of the Lord Jesus Christ, the *judgment*, and the *kingdom* will be together.—2 Tim. 4 : 1.

4. *The locality of the kingdom referred to in v. 14, 22, and 27.* As may already be sufficiently manifest, from these notes, this kingdom, and the heaven of the ransomed of the human family, are one and the same, and the *millenium* belongs to it, is a part of it, viz : the first one thousand years of this eternal state. After the lapse of a thousand years, during which, they who had part in the first resurrection, shall have reigned with Christ, the "rest of the dead" shall live again, i. e. they who are not "blessed and holy," shall have their resurrection, and then satan shall be loosed, and go out as aforetime, to deceive them. But going up on the breadth of the earth, compassing the camp of the saints, and the beloved city, the result will be, that fire shall come down from God out of heaven and devour them, and the devil who deceived them, will be cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night forever, Rev. 20. After this digression, or recapitulation, we proceed with the subject immediately under consideration, viz : *where shall this kingdom be established ?* I might ask, *where were the preceding ?* The prophet having given no intimation, not even the remotest, of its transfer to another globe, or to another world, we are unavoidably left to the inference that it will be established on earth. If we said that the saint's rest, the christian's heaven, the future and eternal home of the saints of the Most High, was in the sun, the moon, or on some one or more of the stars, a few weak visionaries might be delighted. If we taught that it is *somewhere* beyond the stars, where the redeemed, arrayed in their white, blood-washed robes, shall wear their bright crowns ; where the ten thousand times ten thousand of the Lord's ransomed say, "blessing and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne and unto the Lamb forever and ever:" the more *uncertain* the

locality of the inheritance reserved for the saints, the more orthodox, and edifying even, should we perhaps appear unto many. This is melancholy. Alas that it should be so! If, however, I should assert that this kingdom, identifying it with the heavenly state, was to be where all the preceding were, viz: on earth, many, if they gave ear at all, would only hear like the Athenian philosophers heard Paul, that they might know what this babbler said. But why should not *this earth* be the *seat* of the *everlasting* kingdom spoken of in this prophecy? Why should not earth be the place of our future heaven? True, the knowledge of the place *where* heaven is, is not essential to salvation. So we only have the requisite moral fitness, he who purchased heaven for us, will unerringly and safely lead us thither. So we are only found clothed upon with the righteousness which is of faith in the Son of God, then shall we surely stand before the throne, and be numbered with those in whose midst Jesus is, who shall feed them, and lead them unto living fountains of waters. Having done his commandments, we shall be blessed indeed, shall have a right to the tree of life, and shall without fail enter in through the gate into the city. But surely we may ask, *is the locality of heaven a subject of revelation?* If it is, it cannot be good, it cannot be for the advantage of the soul to be without knowledge in this respect, as little as in reference to anything else that is revealed. But why should not earth be the locality of our future heaven? Where would christians, the Lord's ransomed, be so much at home as on earth? What planet, or world has the great Creator honored more, or so much as this? What spot in the universe, have the heavenly hosts regarded with interest so intense? Did *such* mysteries and wonders as cluster around man's redemption, and as were witnessed on earth, transpire on any of the ten thousand bright worlds, which revolve around Jehovah's bright throne? I speak to christians. Let us beware of contemning, or of esteeming as insignificant, that which God has magnified. Little as our earth is; let me quote from another, "our earth already stands alone in the universe, and will stand forth in the annals of eternity illustrious for its fact without a parallel. It is the world on which the mystery of redemption was transacted. It is the world into which Christ came," assumed our nature, taught us the way of life, died for our sins, arose again for our justification, *and to which* he will come again, to judge the quick and the dead. "This is the event which over all our small planet sheds a solemn interest, and draws toward it the wondering gaze of other worlds. And just as in traversing

the deep, when there rises into view some spot of awful interest or affecting memory, you slack the sail, and passengers strain the eye, and look on in silent reverence; so in their journeys through immensity, the flight of the highest intelligences falters into wonder and delay as they near this little globe. There is something in it which makes them feel like Moses at Horeb, "let me draw near and see this great sight;" a marvel and mystery here which angels desire to look into. It is a little world, but it is the world where God was manifest in flesh. And though there may be spots round which the interest gathers in most touching intensity: though it may be possible to visit the very land whose acres were trod by "those blessed feet which our offences nailed to the accursed tree;" though you might like to look on David's town, where the advent took place, and on the hills of Galilee, where his sermons were preached, and on the limpid Gennesareth, which once kissed his buoyant sandals, and on the Jerusalem which he loved and pitied, and where he died, and that Olivet from whose gentle slope the Prince of Peace ascended, I own that with me it is not so much Jerusalem or Palestine as earth, earth herself. Since it received the visit of the Son of God, in the eye of the universe the entire globe is a holy land, and such let it ever be to me.

Without maintaining, or at all supposing, that the *ransomed* will be absolutely restricted to one particular place, and may not visit other regions and other worlds, by divine direction or permission; I proceed to the biblical argument, and assert that the kingdom which shall be given to him who shall come with the clouds of heaven, (v. 13, 14) and which the saints shall possess forever, *will be on earth*. This is proven by the declaration of the Savior, in his sermon on the mount: "blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth,"—Matt. 5: 5. The promise is broad, direct, positive, full and unmistakable. It is without qualification or limit, as respects the persons to whom it is given. The thing promised is specific. It is the inheriting of the earth, and an inheriting which has not yet been, and is not now, but which *shall be*. Hitherto, the dominion of earth has belonged, or rather has been usurped by others. Moreover, this promise not only has not been fulfilled, but its fulfilment, or verification is *impossible* in the present state; in time; for if the meek should, from this hour, attain to that to which they never as yet attained, viz: the ascendancy on earth, how with the generations who sleep in the grave, and who have as valid a title to the promised inheritance, as the present, or any succeeding generation. Not unnecessarily

to multiply words, this promise, like every other that is divine, *must* be fulfilled, but it only *can* find its verification in another state; in the resurrection of the just. Again, that this kingdom (the saint's present hope, and future and eternal rest,) will be *on earth*, is clear from the prayer which our Lord himself taught his disciples: "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as *it is* in heaven," Matt. 6: 10. Whatever the Savior taught, or directed his disciples to pray for, *must* be attainable. But the will of God never was done on earth by man, since the apostacy, as it is done in heaven, and manifestly will not be, as long as the wicked continue, or as long as the tares grow among the wheat, which we know will be until the harvest, or end of the world. As this consummation, so devoutly to be wished and prayed for, must be realized, but never was, and under existing circumstances cannot be, we must look forward to its realization *then*, when all the tares (the wicked) shall have been gathered, and cast into the unquenchable fire; when the kingdom is given to the saints of the Most High, and all dominions serve and obey him, (v. 27) then, and not before, will this prayer be fully answered. But *then* God's will shall indeed be done on earth, as it is done in heaven. Once more, that this kingdom will be on earth, is *unanswerably demonstrated*, from the welcome which Christ will give to his people, the righteous, the multitude of the first born; to all his saints, in the great day. "Then shall the king say unto them on his right hand, come, ye blessed of my father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."—Matt. 25: 34. God not only created man at first, but created him on earth, and gave him dominion over all the earth.—Gen. 1: 24. Now *this*, viz: the earth, is *the only kingdom* God ever prepared for man "from the foundation of the world." *But this he did prepare*, and this kingdom he actually gave to him, but his dominion man forfeited by the apostacy of the first Adam. *To this kingdom*, and to no other, all those who are recovered by the mediation of the second Adam, (Christ) will be restored and welcomed, in the resurrection and final judgment.

That this kingdom will be on earth, is further manifest from the hope which the ransomed expressed in the new song, which John heard them sing, whilst prostrate before the Lamb. "Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests:

and we shall reign on the earth."—Rev. 5: 9, 10. *They did not reign while in the flesh.* Many of them had been poor, despised, hated and persecuted. *They did not reign as disembodied spirits.* They said, "we shall reign." They expected this as a *future* consummation. If they reigned, neither in the body, nor out of the body, their reign must of necessity be in the resurrection, on the one hand, and on the other, the locality is specified, viz: "on earth." The land of sojourn, exile almost, of the saved, will be their future and eternal home; the scene of their sufferings and tribulations, the house of their rejoicing; the arena of their combat, and through grace, of victory, the temple of their triumph.

Before the earth however, can be fitted for the everlasting kingdom, it must pass through the fires of the judgment day. God promised a new creation; "For behold, I create new heavens and a new earth: and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind."—Isaiah 65: 17. The apostle Peter admonishing christians to holy diligence, in view of the dissolution by fire of the present state, or order of things, encouraged and comforted them at the same time, with the hope *based on God's promise*, of new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.—2 Pet. 3: 13. What God promised by the mouth of his prophet, that which Peter looked for, *according to this promise*, the apostle John in prophetic vision saw: "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away."—Rev. 21: 1. But this promise, this hope, this vision, if they teach us anything, it is the interesting fact, that the future residence of the redeemed is earth; earth, now "so wicked and tainted, that it must pass through the fire, withal so consecrated and so dear to heaven, that it must not be destroyed; but a new earth with righteousness dwelling in it, shall perpetuate to distant ages its own amazing story." Finally, Canaan, the promised land, was, as every biblical student knows, a type of heaven; of the rest which remaineth for the people of God. It was promised to Abraham and to his seed: "And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession."—Gen. 17: 8. "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made."—Gal. 3: 16. Who Abraham was we know, and who was mainly intended by his seed we know also. Hear the apostle: "He saith not, and to seeds, as of many, but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ."—Gal. 3: 16. The promise then, we repeat it, was made to Abraham, and to his seed, i. e. to Christ. But Abraham never

owned a foot of the land, save the cave of Machpelah, which he purchased from Ephron the Hittite as a place for burial.—Gen. 23. Jesus was so poor when traversing its hills and valleys, prosecuting the great object of his mission, that he had not where to lay his head.—Matt. 8 : 20. They must yet inherit, *not elsewhere but here*, to verify the promise ; Abraham in the resurrection, Jesus at the sounding of the trumpet of the seventh angel.—Rev. 11 : 15. The seventh trumpet is the last, and at the last trump, shall be the glorious resurrection of the sainted dead, and the sudden change of the then living christians.—1 Cor. 15 : 51. Then (at the sounding of the seventh and last trumpet) and *not before*, shall great voices be heard in heaven, “saying, the kingdoms of this world are become *the kingdoms* of our Lord, and of his Christ ; and he shall reign forever and ever.”—Rev. 11 : 15.

ARTICLE IV.

FAITH AND UTILITARIANISM.

“No man liveth to himself.” Yet for whom and how he lives, few understand. Among the mysteries of our mysterious life, not the least is this, viz : that we seem to know and think we know when we do not. The progress of science shows how little we know. Once the elements were reduced to four, now they have multiplied to almost one hundred. Who knows what an element is, or an ultimate fact, if by this expression be meant anything more than the extent of our present knowledge. Our senses furnish us with information concerning sensible objects around us, yet the information which they impart is very limited, a few only of the properties of material bodies ; of the substance of the bodies, or their essence, we know nothing. Telescopic and microscopic glasses reveal to us a few more of the attributes of matter, and this, for the present, constitutes the limit of our knowledge. Within the boundaries thus marked out, there is a wide world of knowledge, small indeed, and insignificant, compared with what is beyond. Yet of this small world how little is known. Of the properties of bodies we are made acquainted with but one or two aspects. How many more there are to other beings, with other senses, and other modes of perception, we cannot even

conjecture. The insect, which is crushed beneath our feet, beholds wonders which our imperfect vision can never reach. The butterfly sports before his fellows, with a plumage of wondrous length and richness of coloring, whilst our unassisted eyes can see nothing but an anatomy of a wing covered with colored dust. Much less do we know of the constitution, the attributes and actions of the human soul. Here the aid of the most powerful glasses fails. Instinct opens a little vista, to the limits of which our mental vision conducts us. Reason conducts us one step farther in our inquiries, and then we are thrown upon the experience of mankind, and the communications which are made from one to the other. More profoundly ignorant are we of the ultimate consequences of thought and action upon the world. The wily politician is caught in the meshes of the web which he is weaving. The well prepared discourse, of the excellency and success of which the eloquent and learned divine entertains no doubt, falls powerless upon the ear of the audience, whilst the undigested and unarranged remarks of the desponding and almost heart-broken minister of the gospel, come into the soul like oil upon the troubled waters, and the gentle rain upon the parched earth. The kings of the earth, and the wise men, meet in council, and digest and arrange their plans, and carry them into execution. Fleets and armies are assembled and precipitated upon each other, and death and destruction hold a carnival upon poor human nature. Are man's purposes accomplished, or God's, or both? "He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh. He maketh the wrath of man to praise him, and restraineth the remainder of wrath."

We return then to our position, viz: we seem to know, and we think we know, when we do not. Apparent good at hand, we secure. We think it is good, and yet it may be a serious evil. We trust to our imperfect knowledge, we become vain; assurance supplants modesty, and apparent success produces boldness, and thus are we driven forward in this world. May not, however, apparent evil be real good, and may not present suffering be both the preparation and the security of future enjoyment? Who can tell? The selfishness of man leads him to seek the present good, whilst the want of reflection and ignorance exclude the suspicion of future evils. Folly is confident, wisdom considers. Sense looks to present enjoyment, faith, soaring on lofty pinions, and enlarging the sphere of her vision, looks to the future. We propose to contemplate the attributes of these two forces, *utility* and *faith*.

The age in which we live is called utilitarian. Yet it is no more so than any which has preceded it. We will not undervalue our age or our cotemporaries. They are worthy of all praise. Whilst we would not employ a single drop of ink to tarnish the glory of antiquity, we regard our age as a giant, moving forward with astonishing rapidity, in the fulfilment of the purposes of God, and the men of the age genuine sons of Issachar, both capable of bearing burdens, and wise to discern the signs of the times. Every age, and mankind generally, are largely utilitarian.

Utility, we have said, seeks the present good. Its praises are sung by all classes and conditions of men. It constitutes the moving spring to the great mass of the machinery of society. It nerves the arm of the farmer and mechanic, and makes them strong to endure the labors of the day. It fills the heart of the merchant and mariner with courage to dare the dangers of the deep, and to expose themselves to the inhospitable climate of the tropics and the poles. It enters into the sacred desk, the halls of legislation, the school, the family circle, and everywhere asks the same question, "who will show us any good?" The child asks, "what's the use?" The school-boy has learned in classic phrase to say "*cui bono*:" The man of business inquires, with the hungry look of gain, "will it pay?" whilst the worldly-minded religionists, with heaven-daring impiety exclaim, "what profit is it that we have kept his ordinance, and have walked mournfully before the Lord of hosts?"

We must not be understood as condemning this spirit unheard, or writing hard things against it, whilst we refuse to record its wonderful achievements. We cannot deny that its force has been, and is yet, almost miraculous. Railroads, steamboats, the application of science to the useful arts in the invention of machinery, in the various departments of industry, and the yet more wonderful application of electricity as a medium of communication between distant parts of the earth, all are the product of that utility whose praises we are now considering. These simplify labor, and substitute the productive labor of natural agents for bone and sinew and muscle. Their advantages, in a temporal aspect, cannot be easily overrated. The distant parts of the earth, with the products of their industry and skill, are brought together. Trade is wonderfully stimulated, wealth abounds, whilst the luxuries of every climate, and the skill of the most delicate machinery, are called into requisition, to please the fancy, and to gratify the palate. With all this, the comforts of life abound. The poor man lives better and lives longer. His table is covered

with nourishing food, where once a single dish hardly supplied his necessities, and he clothes himself with broadcloth, where once his scanty means furnished him with only the coarsest material. Indeed the facilities for the acquisition of wealth, are so much multiplied, that it seems needful for the poor man, with ordinary abilities, only to throw himself into the current of events, and it will not fail to bear him on to prosperity. The wheel of fortune is constantly turning, and bringing up prizes for those who worship at her shrine. In addition to what might be called the ordinary and natural advantages of these powerful natural agents, the impulse which is given to mind may be regarded as far more important. The idea of a railroad on which passengers are carried with locomotive energy, at the rate of fifty miles an hour, is certainly a large one, and capable of great expansion. When the mind has once fully received it, and felt its power, it cannot fail to enlarge and exalt it. The mind thus influenced, will scorn to travel at the dull, prosy rate of our forefathers, who, in their simplicity, knew no greater speed than that of post coaches. Much more is the mind enlarged by the conception of telegraphic communication. Thought is wonderful and mysterious. The communication of thought by means of language, is more so. A few sounds, modified by the palate, teeth, tongue and lips, fill the soul with sadness, or excite it to extatic joy. This is effected when we are near each other, and the countenance and gesture give additional value to that which is uttered. But to converse with a friend hundreds of miles distant, making a few dots and dashes intelligible, and communicating thought with a rapidity which outstrips time himself, and the sun in his blazing chariot, the conception is almost overpowering! Whither will the spirit of the age lead us?

What we desire to say is, that these products of the utilitarian spirit, wonderful in their practical application, will stimulate the mind in the same direction, bringing science from her lofty throne, far removed from the sordid interests of the day, and making her tributary to the lowest purposes of our depraved human nature. Science is called heaven-born, because she is conversant only with the laws which govern matter and mind, in their various and multiplied relations. She stoops not from her, lofty height, to mingle with the profit and loss, the higgling and chaffering for dollars and cents, which belong to the every day business of life. Satisfied with having determined the laws which control the worlds, either in their masses, or parts, or particles, she retires to the pure empyrean, the

place of her birth, seeking to soar yet higher and be assimilated yet more nearly to the image of her great creator.

Utilitarianism, with eyes full of greed, seizes the laws, and converts them to her own purposes. Under the mask of kindness, she approaches all classes of society, and promises them blessings in profusion. To the capitalist she offers investments in machinery, and the application of science to the arts, more productive and certain in their returns than any he has yet realized: whilst to the operatives in the several departments of labor, she promises increased wages and comparative exemption from toil, and she fulfils her promises. Whatever charge may be preferred against this spirit, it cannot be said to deceive because all its promises are based upon experiment, and therefore, all can be reduced to the test from which they derived their existence.

It must be conceded to utilitarianism also, that our home comforts are the products of her skill. She builds, and arranges, and warms, and lights our houses, multiplies the enjoyments of the table, weaves our carpets, and spreads our couches, so that Solomon in all his glory, and England's Elizabeth in all her majesty, were far behind our ordinary artisans in the comforts of life. 'Tis not wonderful, therefore, that the poor man should call her his friend, and that the rich man should give her a seat at his table. She brings the rich and the poor together, and shows them how they are dependent upon each other, and, whilst she points out to the one how his gains may be multiplied, she convinces the other that, with industry and perseverance, he may rival and surpass his wealthy neighbor. There is another side to this picture. It would not be complete without the shading. The shading, from the nature of the case, must be dark. For we have many hard things to write against this same utilitarianism. To say that it is general, would be expressing only its wide-spread influence, and might be commendatory, rather than condemnatory. We say then,

1st. *Its true spirit is earthly and sensual.* It provides for the body. It looks only to this life. Its horizon is bounded by sense and time, and if intellect and genius are brought under its influence, as they oft-times are, they lose at once the loftiness of their character, and prostitute their powers to purposes degrading to their nature. These positions need no proof, inasmuch as they belong to its very nature. It is the world spirit which rushes forward in the race of pleasure, exclaiming, "let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die;" "*dum vivimus vivamus.*" It lives in the present, or, if it look into the

future of this life, it is only under the influence of self-love, which seeks to multiply and prolong the enjoyments of the present.

The element of the higher life, faith, hope and eternity, it excludes entirely. Not that morality, in its popular acceptance, is disregarded or uncultivated, for this is needful to the existence of society, in which alone utilitarianism can either exist or flourish. But this morality has no vital union, either with the precepts or life of the Son of God. Its fundamental precept is not, "Love thy neighbor as thyself," or, "As ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them;" oh no! it is the morality of the best bargain, and teaches by the most summary process, which is by example. "Take care of yourself." "Regard every man as a rogue, until he proves himself to be honest." "Make the best bargain you can, for every man's eye must be his market." As for faith in man or hope in his reformation, if wicked, or reliance upon the Providence or promises of God, or a calm reference to the day of judgment, when the affairs of this life, great and small, shall be adjudicated, there is nothing of this.

Therefore, this spirit has not the power to exalt or to purify the character. It fastens selfishness upon the soul, and drags angelic beings from heaven to earth. No man was ever made better by it, although some have resisted its influence, and have used it as an instrument of good. The young man, educated under pious influences in the family circle, devoted to God in baptism, and in due season, renewing for himself his baptismal vows, is consigned to the care of a business man, to be educated in that particular avocation. He soon discovers that the principles of trade come into conflict with the precepts of morality, which had guided him to the present time. There is but one alternative before him, either to abandon the business, or yield to the spirit of utilitarianism. If he yield, the pressure from without becomes more powerful, until the aspirations of his soul have been contracted within the limits of his warehouse or office, and his grandest conception is the speculation which will yield the largest and speediest return. This, it is true, need not be the necessary result. Yet this is the tendency, and to this conclusion do all the influences operating upon him tend. This spirit, yet farther, panders to vice and crime. Wealth, ease, luxury, refinement, sensuality, vice, crime; this is the ladder which it climbs, and to this bad eminence does it too often arrive. Wealth, coveted and earnestly pursued by so many, is not only not free from danger, but tends to positive injury. It multiplies wants and woes. War and

slavery, and sensuality, are its legitimate fruits. It does indeed gratify every earthly want, yet this very gratification leads the soul from God, to worship and trust in Mammon. But is not wealth the fosterer of the fine arts, and are not the productions of the masters in painting, poetry and statuary and music, now with us, and have they not softened and refined the rude and savage into the perfection of human nature, which we now discover in the polished nations of the earth? If, by the phrase softening and refining, be meant improvement in heart and life, the position cannot be maintained. For it is a matter of history, that the ages of nations in which the fine arts flourished, from that of Pericles down to Leo the tenth, and later, were characterized by a more than ordinary degree of licentiousness and immorality. And the countries in which the fine arts now have their home, and to which pilgrimages are made by men of taste and genius, as by the pious to the shrines of saints and martyrs, are the hot-beds of pollution. Here vice is legalized, and the State steps forward, with the sword in one hand and the purse in the other, to uphold and defend it. Everywhere and always has wealth been the parent of luxury, and all the appliances of genius, put forth for the production of the one, were just so many efforts, and so successful, in the creation of the other. If it be said that wealth has no such tendency in itself, that it is the perversion of the gifts of God, of which we complain, and that the highest and holiest gifts, even christianity, have been in like manner perverted.

We reply that this is partly true. The depravity of man does indicate the cause of the evil, up to a certain point. Good men have employed their wealth for the glory of God, and they have acquired it, in the exercise of love to God and man. Theirs' was not the utilitarian spirit, either in the acquisition, or the disbursement, but the spirit of faith and love. Here the power of faith and the influence of unseen realities resisted and counteracted the power of utilitarianism, and the tendency of wealth.

Wickedness is indeed subjective in man. It is within him, as a fountain, and wells up, and pours forth its bitter waters, over the earth. The world without us corresponds to the world within, and, whilst it cannot be said to be objectively wicked, it furnishes the occasion for all the evil that exists. Wealth, which is but the multiplication of opportunities and occasions to evil, for this very reason, lures the soul away from the path of rectitude, and tends directly to the results which have alrea-

dy been indicated. Wealth, therefore, tending to luxury and its attendants, makes depraved man more and more wicked. It leads to the forgetfulness and disregard of God and his providence. It fosters the spirit of independence and contempt for others. It leads man, with the vainglorious king of Babylon, to exclaim, "Is this not great Babylon which I have built," and with the haughty Pharaoh, "Who is the Lord that I should serve him." Hence, when this spirit becomes the animating spirit of a country, or of the world, its power increases with every contribution which is made by the individual. The streams, thus flowing together from innumerable fountains, become at length a mighty river, which sweeps away, with irresistible energy, every thing that comes within the influence of its currents. Thus, good men, the people of God, devout, humble and self-denying, acting upon the utilitarian principle, become wealthy, and are gradually drawn into the current of the world, and are borne upon its bosom into eternity. This evil, thus originating and progressing, oftentimes becomes so great that the ordinary means of God's providence and grace are inadequate to arrest them. More severe and desperate remedies must be applied, and the God of the universe calls for wars and earthquakes, and fires and floods, to swallow up and burn out, and wash away the monstrous evils thus generated, and desfilng the earth. Here history advances to teach philosophy by examples, and the providence of God, which is only history in a new relationship, confirming and impressing the precepts of natural and revealed religion. The only way of safety then, is never to come within the influence of this flood of iniquity, nor to cherish the spirit which prompts only to self-gratification, and the enjoyment of the day.

2. *Utilitarianism fails in the object of life.* Men animated by this spirit, fancy themselves wise, and all others fools. They are persuaded that *they* possess the true secret to happiness, and that secret is some form of present good. They err in this, that they substitute the means for the end. If we assume, what we must constantly affirm, that this life is only the beginning of our existence, and that the happiness of the life to come, which is eternal, is conditioned upon the holiness of character secured here, then reason teaches emphatically, and experience, with both hands lifted up, declares that happiness is not of earthly origin, whilst revelation, in calm and solemn tones, affirms that "it is through much tribulation that we enter into the kingdom of heaven." Nowhere but in the school of the atheist and the unbeliever, are we taught, that the end of this life is wealth, or fame, or knowledge, or happiness. If

it be, then have all men failed most sadly; and most of all, he who was perfect God and perfect man united, and who, by way of distinction and emphasis, was called "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief."

What great purpose God has formed, in reference to this earth, and its relations to other portions of his universe, we know not. What is the origin of evil, and why it was permitted, and whether the ultimate result will be a larger amount of happiness, and if so, how, are questions whose solution is equally difficult. The relations, however, of the individual to his God, and to his neighbor, and to his own happiness, are clearly revealed. "Man is born to trouble, as the sparks fly upwards." Life is a pilgrimage, a journey, a race, a warfare, and the close of it, to those who love God and man, is the beginning of a life of happiness, such as the loftiest imagination could not conceive, and revelation only disclose. Revelation teaches that the glory of God, and the good of man, are the end or object of life; and that he who has not been influenced by these motives, has failed, so far as motive is concerned, however God may have overruled his conduct for good. We ought not to conceal from ourselves the sublime truth, that the Lord reigns, that he has his plans and purposes, and that he makes the efforts of his enemies subservient to the accomplishment of his own wise and benevolent designs.

This spirit is natural to man, and it requires much experience of the world, and especially of the grace of God, to enable a man to overcome it. This spirit gains strength, and becomes supreme, in a country such as ours, and under circumstances in which success attends the efforts of almost every industrious man.

Hence it is not strange, that it should enter and influence every walk in life. Thus, the whole subject of education is brought under the pressure of a calculation of how much knowledge and mental training are necessary for success in this or that business. By certain rules, well known to those who act upon them, it is ascertained that, to learn to read and write, and cast accounts, is quite sufficient to secure the prosperity of the farmer and mechanic, whilst a step farther, and a year longer, will be allowed to the learned professions. For, "why should so much time be wasted in the acquisition of knowledge, when there is so much to do in the world?" Thus ignorance is at a premium, and piety and zeal for the cause of the Lord are introduced to sustain it.

The influence of this course upon all the walks of life is injurious. The merchant, mechanic and farmer, seldom rise in

knowledge above the level of the point at which they commenced life, and but little is accomplished upon this theory, for the world, by what are called the learned professions. Hence the want of thoroughness in scholarship generally, in this country, and the defective condition of our high schools and colleges.

We have already intimated that this spirit, which pervades the whole land, and all parts of society, has also invaded the ranks of the ministry, entered into the study, and ascended the sacred desk. It is seen in the preparation for the work of the ministry, in which an ability to speak fluently, is made a substitute for real knowledge, and a flippant account of the time and place of conversion, for the evidence of an humble spirit and a consistent christian life. Our ministerial brethren, and they who are conversant with our educational operations, will be able to realize the force of these remarks.

It is seen in the preparation for the sacred desk, the choice of a text, singular rather than solid, and calculated to display the genius of the preacher, rather than to promote the edification of the people. From the same source, proceed the wit and anecdote, the affected tone and manner, and all those appliances, the design and effect of which are, to produce an erroneous impression.

The simplicity of our faith and worship is greatly disturbed when we behold the gorgeous decorations of some christian churches, the character and costliness of the music, and the direct means which are employed, to fill these churches on God's holy day. Alongside of this apparatus to attract the multitude, we place the apparatus employed to convert them, or rather to make them church members, and we say in reference to them all, that they are utilitarian; they look only to the present, and they are deficient in the element of faith and the spirit of the Master. The church, instead of resisting and counteracting, imbibes and acts out the spirit of the world. Her conservative power is enfeebled; gradually will she be overcome; and at last, as in the age of Constantine, will she become worldly-minded, and be prepared for a great declension in spirituality.

In the same category, must be placed what are called the benevolent operations of the church, or, in plainer language, the mode employed to obtain money for the purpose of carrying forward the operations of the church. There is a great want of unity and coöperation, each one working for himself, and not for the general good, talking largely at conventions and synodical meetings, raising huge platforms, sufficiently large to

cover a continent, and at home, after such gigantic efforts, lapsing into inactivity and indolence. One approves and another rejects the agency system, and consequently little or nothing is accomplished by either. Thus our colleges are unendowed, and are permitted to compete with the liberally endowed of other communions, and all our benevolent societies languish out a feeble existence.

A number of literary institutions spring up almost simultaneously, and all clamor for endowment. If one comes into existence in the east, the west must have hers, and a larger number, because she is great. The south and the north claim equal rights and privileges, and thus, the attention and the energies of the church are distracted and divided, and nothing is thoroughly accomplished for the highest good of the church and the world. Education in the church is not placed upon a broad or a solid foundation. Teachers cannot extend and enlarge the field of their knowledge, because their whole time is occupied in giving instruction. A proper division of literary labor is impossible, for the same reason. A large and well selected library, which is the student's storehouse, and a chemical and philosophical apparatus, sufficient to give practicalness to the instructions of the professor, cannot be secured, for want of funds. Thus education languishes, and the only foundation, upon which denominational strength and influence can rest securely and be extended, is wanting.

Under such circumstances, the Lutheran church cannot occupy the elevated position which her age and doctrines, and her influence in Europe seem to require. But we have insensibly wandered from a general to a particular position, and from the consideration of utilitarianism, in the abstract, to that form of it which is developing itself in the Lutheran church. We trust that this will not be regarded as a fault, but will be charged to that love for her welfare which has shaped our whole course of life.

We turn to the antidote of the evil which we have been considering, and say that it is found in *Faith*.

We define faith to be subjection to the will of God, under all circumstances. The spirit of faith cries out continually, "Lord what wilt thou have me to do?" and perseveringly, patiently and humbly, pursues the path of duty, under the most inauspicious circumstances.

The essential difference between utilitarianism and faith, consists in this, viz: the former seeks profit, the latter the will of God. The former lives in the present, the latter in the future. The former glorifies man, and is glorified of him, the

latter glorifies God, and is glorified of him. The one is the offspring of man, the other is the gift of God. The one rejoices in seen, and the other in unseen realities. The one mourns over the loss of property, or friends, as a loss never to be repaired, the other, with aching heart and swimming eyes, rejoices in treasures in heaven, and loved ones sent before into a better world. The one, like the children of Israel in the wilderness, desires to return to the flesh pots of Egypt that he may eat and be filled. The other goes forth, with Abraham, at the command of God, into a land which he knew not, and wherever he tarries erects an altar, and calls upon the name of the Lord.

We need not look to other times and other lands, for illustrations of faith and its opposite; we have them before us constantly. Here is a young man, in whose heart God has awakened the desire of preaching the gospel to perishing men. That desire lies there, many months, unquenched and undimmed, amidst all the discouragements with which poverty and daily toil have surrounded it. Modesty and humility prevent the disclosure of this desire, even to a beloved pastor. In the meanwhile, efforts are put forth, during leisure hours, to acquire knowledge such as to justify the hope that this desire may be gratified. At length modesty is overcome by the pressure of the feeling of duty, which overwhelms every other consideration. He makes known his purpose, and the necessary facilities are furnished. The prospect of a thorough education, and an elevated and influential position in society, is before him. Here is a trial of faith, not in the length of time necessary to complete his course—though that, to one anxious to engage in the active duties of the ministry, is a heavy burden—but in the change of position and prospect. To a young man, in the humbler walks in life, there can be no stronger trial of character than such an elevation. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that many young men, in this situation, lose their humility, forget whence they came, and the whole object of their vocation, and, instead of serving the cause of Christ and the church, become a reproach to both.

Instead of yielding to the suggestions of vanity, and looking with pride upon those over whom the providence of God has elevated him, our aspirant for the ministerial office keeps constantly in view the great object for which Christ called him into the work of the ministry. He meditates much upon the value of the soul; much upon his own insufficiency, and the all-sufficiency of his master. Along with his classical and scientific and theological course, he seeks to obtain a profound

knowledge of his own heart; to discover the ways of sin and Satan, by studying his own heart, tracing the operation of cause and effect there, by frequent reviews of his own experience, and thus laying broad the foundation of christian character.

Thus equipped, he is introduced into the ministry. The hands of the Presbytery are laid upon him, and he is ordained to the sacred office and work.

With what fervent prayers and longing desires, does he go forth to preach to the perishing. He seeks not lofty place, large income, or prominence in the church, but usefulness. He enters upon his pastoral labors and relationship, as though they would continue through life. He is engaged in his Master's work, and looks for his reward from him. He lays his plans for extended and prolonged usefulness among his people, and the community at large, not only in the pulpit in the selection and preparation of his subjects, but in pastoral visits, in the training of the young, and in the whole subject of education and moral reform. Though he see no immediate good fruit springing up, he is willing to wait God's own time, confident that the work of faith, and labor of love, and patience of hope can be called into exercise and cultivated only under circumstances like these. His best plans, perhaps call forth opposition, and hope, awakened by apparent success, sinks down into despondency. His faithfulness may have called forth ill will and hostility, yet his faith is fixed upon the promises of the Master, and he feels the force of the sentiment of the apostle: "It is required of stewards that they be found faithful." Christ has promised to reward him, not according to his success, but his fidelity. Perhaps he has accomplished much good, but so gradually, that neither he, nor others have perceived it. Perhaps his charge and the whole community, are in that peculiar state, not unfrequently found as the result of long continued fidelity, in and out of the pulpit, when they are prepared for a profound and extensive awakening. It is the darkness before the dawn, or the faint streaks of morning before the full orb'd day.

Under such circumstances, this man of faith and humility, by the advice of others, calls to his aid, for a season, a brother noted for his success in producing religious excitements. The consequence is an extraordinary revival of religion pervading, not only the congregation, but the whole community. The stranger is regarded by the multitude as the great power of God. Wonderful are his preaching powers, and far and wide is his fame extended abroad. Perhaps his success, in other charges, was due to similar foregoing circumstances. The man

of faith knows not how to solve the enigma which is before him, viz : his own want of success, and the wonderful success attending the labors of his brother. He does not consider that, if he had continued his labors a little longer unaided, the same, and perhaps more abiding results would have ensued. Time, however, is a revealer of secrets, and, attended by reflection, teaches lessons of wisdom. The man of faith maintains his position, and daily secures the respect and confidence of all who know him. The smiles of his heavenly father rest upon him, and "he brings forth his righteousness as the light, and his salvation as the noon-day."

In striking contrast with the foregoing picture, is the utilitarian preacher. He *condescends* to become a preacher. Seeks, in the sacred office, his own advantage, and not the salvation of souls. He is hired, and therefore must have his price. He endeavors to preach to the satisfaction of those who have hired him, and not for the glory of God. When the services of the Sabbath are closed, he is not concerned about the effect of his labors, and follows them not, with the eye of faith, that he may gather the fruit of wisdom and encouragement for the future. He is soon dissatisfied. He finds very little to his taste, and thinks that he may be better suited, and may succeed better in another field. There is a prevailing idea, among preachers of this sort, that a longer residence than three or four, or at most, six years, is unprofitable to both parties. That first impressions are the best, and that on their entrance upon a new field they will be likely to effect the most good. This conclusion is correct, in reference to those who have not formed habits of study, or are deficient in piety, or proper self-control, or knowledge, or in altogether. But how can it be true in the experience of those whose piety and zeal increase rather than diminish with the increased knowledge which they have of the wants of their people; and whose lives are so godly that they are living epistles, known and read by all? How can it be true, in reference to those who, having laid a good foundation for knowledge before they entered the ministry, in a well disciplined mind, are daily adding to their stock of knowledge, by personal experience and observation, and the thorough study of God's word? We would rather look for enlarged and still increasing usefulness, the longer they continue in the same field of labor. We would expect that their systematic efforts to do good, would acquire increasing power, with the increase of years, and that old age, under such circumstances, would carry with it a grace and power such as all the ardor of youth and the vigor of manhood could not surpass. We entertain the

opinion that these views are sustained by many facts in the history of the church, past and present.

With this definition and illustration of faith, we assert that faith accomplishes the will of God, and finds its reward in him. If faith be subjection to the will of God, under all circumstances, then the man of faith is always doing the will of God. This is his aim and effort, up to his knowledge and ability. No one can remove from his mind this consciousness, and in it he has pleasure. He is not indifferent to the consequences of his course, for the evidence of success, in a sensible and tangible form, is a source of much comfort and encouragement; yet as God has not designated the measure of his success, and has taught him that faithfulness is required of a steward, he looks more to his motives and obedience, than to success. He may be preparing the way for another. He may be breaking up the fallow ground, and putting in the seed, and another, better qualified, or not so well qualified, will be required to reap.

It might be asked how a man of faith, or any other man, can ascertain the will of God, under all circumstances. We reply, precisely in the same way as the father of the faithful, and all his children did. By giving heed to God's revealed will, and, in the absence of this, by employing the intelligence and reason, and all the natural powers possessed by him, in accordance with the known object of life, and the principles which have been given for the government of life. It must be manifest then, that under the influence of faith, principles and law must govern, and not impulse and profit: That the will of God, and not the will of the creature, is supreme: That, as certainly as the needle inclines to the pole, so certainly and invariably does faith lead to God. Self is lost in the higher feeling of obedience, and the passions, which are the ministers and masters of self, become the servants of righteousness. From these remarks, we can see how the evils of utilitarianism may be corrected by faith. How a ministry and a people and a nation, would be elevated into a higher life, just in proportion to the power and prevalence of faith. The evils of which there is so much complaint, in our church, would speedily pass away, under the influence of a faith which looks for a city to come, and which finds its reward for all sacrifices and self-denial, in the approbation of a good conscience in the sight of God. The wealth, and talents, and influence, which men possess, would be held in subjection to the will of God. Our institutions of learning would be endowed,

up to their highest capacity for usefulness. Our ministry would be made up of learning and piety, and zeal and brotherly love, and the number would not fall short of the necessities of the church, whilst the benevolent operations of the church would not need to beg from door to door, for charity, in the name of the Lord. More than this, the greatest amount of good would be accomplished in the world. Apparent good is not always real good. We often think we know, when we are ignorant. "There is a way that seemeth right to a man, but the end thereof is the way of death." Who can distinguish between the apparent and the real? Only he who knows the end from the beginning, and who is, therefore, capable of pointing out the right way, and furnishing rules of conduct. The missionary who, like Gordon Hall, is permitted to arrive safely on a heathen shore, and then to die, so far as human foresight penetrates, seems to accomplish nothing for the Lord. But he is permitted, ere he leaves this world, with one foot in heathendom, and the other on the confines of eternity, to realize the miseries of the heathen, and to send an appeal to the church, which caused every nerve and fibre of her system to tingle. He awakened an interest on the subject of missions, such as had never before been felt.

Thus there are men, in all the walks of life, humble, unassuming, unobtrusive, unnoticed and unknown, who are working out the problem of life which God has given them, with a power and success, which the most aspiring and self-confident can never rival. They are God's hidden ones. The secret of the Lord is with them. Their lives are hid with Christ in God, and when Christ, who is their life, shall appear, they also shall appear with him in glory.

All the great enterprises of the day, political and religious, educational and benevolent, are carried into successful operation by men of faith. Some of them die before the foundations are fairly laid of the structures which they had conceived and projected. Others complete what they had commenced. Some are permitted only to indicate principles and plans, and then die. The army of martyrs is not yet all recruited, and will not be, until the warfare is ended. The last martyr will die with the last sinner.

If these positions be correct, then it follows that the object of life can be fulfilled only by faith. Faith triumphs over all spiritual enemies, over all opposition from the world and the depravity of man, and pursues such a course as to please God. Here is the great end of life. We are the creatures of an omnipotent, all-wise and holy creator. Our ignorance and impo-

tency would naturally drive us to him for wisdom and strength. When, therefore, under a profound sense of our insufficiency, we confide in him, as he has been pleased to reveal himself, and discharge, to the best of our ability, the duties which he has imposed upon us, we are accomplishing the great business of life. We have to do with duty here. How long we will be required to continue in this service, we know not. The proper discharge of duty is the highest honor we can confer upon God, and the greatest good to man. After duty comes reward. That belongs to another state of being. Thus then, faith waits patiently in the discharge of duty, until the great change and release shall come. Then it will yield to vision, and will be lost in the glories of heaven.

ARTICLE V.

INFIDELITY: ITS METAMORPHOSES AND ITS PRESENT ASPECTS.

ARTICLE III.

Naturalism, or, the denial of the Divine Providential Government.

By the Rev. H. I. Schmidt, D. D. New York.

"But wandering oft with brute unconscious gaze,
Man marks not Thee, marks not the mighty hand,
That, ever busy, wheels the silent spheres;
Works in the secret deep; shoots steaming, thence
The fair profusion that o'erspreads the spring;
Flings from the sun direct the flaming day;
Feeds every creature; hurls the tempest forth;
And, as on earth this grateful change revolves,
With transport touches all the springs of life."

Thomson's Seasons.

THE subject named at the head of this article, is the one next discussed in the able essay, of which we have undertaken to present a brief review, connecting with it such discussions of our own as may seem necessary. It claims our serious attention, and demands an extended discussion; for it is, like pantheism, a form of infidelity which has found much acceptance, and some exceedingly ingenious advocates, in our day. This ingenuity, it is true, is characterized by great disingenuousness, and a most unscrupulous suppression or garbling and

perversion of facts vitally important to the soundness of the argument on the great question at issue, and by a recklessly headlong assumption of principles, which have not even the most shadowy foundation. The infidel philosophers of this school thus illustrate, like others already dealt with, the marvellous credulity, the immeasurable capacity of belief, possessed by those who have chivalrously volunteered on a crusade against the Bible, and the alleged superstition of those who most rationally, and upon the best of evidence, believe its divine teachings. We quote the introductory sentences of our author, for the purpose of subjoining a caution respecting the terms which he employs. "Naturalism, or, as it is sometimes called, rationalism, is distinguishable enough from atheism and pantheism. The rationalist is distinguished from the atheist by the theoretical belief of a Supreme Power, and he is distinguished from the pantheist by his denial of an ever-present and all-pervading divine energy. The pantheist says, God is at hand; the rationalist says, God is afar off." The point to which we wish to direct attention, is, that Mr. Pearson here uses the word rationalism in a wider and somewhat different sense from that with which we have so long been familiar, in connexion with "German rationalism." This has no direct reference to the divine government of the world, or the divine providence: it is the antagonist of supernaturalism, and designates the denial of a direct supernatural revelation, and the application of reason and free thinking to all the concerns of religion and religious conviction, whilst supernaturalism acknowledges and absolutely submits to the supreme authority of the direct and positive revelation which God has given in the written word. Hence rationalism explains according to the notions of self-dependent human reason; speculates, philosophizes, and anthropomorphizes, where supernaturalism reverently bows, in simple faith, to the paramount authority of the inspired volume. Naturalism and rationalism are at heart, and essentially the same thing: the difference simply consists in this, that the former would banish the Almighty from the physical creation, and denies his government of the world, while the latter denies his presence in the Bible, and in the new creation of the christian religion:—both are influenced by the same motives, and governed by the same principles. And yet, although thus identical in spirit and in their general aim, it is, for obvious reasons, necessary thus to distinguish between the well-known theistic rationalism of Germany, and that which our author has here more immediately in view, and which, as synonymous with naturalism, will now be explained.

The naturalism which we are here to consider acknowledges, indeed, that God is, and that he originally created the world; but it is blind to all the evidences of his all-wise, constantly exercised providential agency, which are to rational and scriptural piety, as abundant as those which prove him the infinitely intelligent and almighty creator. To these philosophers the starry heavens, with all the wondrous relations and movements of their countless worlds, the earth and sea with all their beauties and forces, and their teeming life, the vicissitudes of the seasons, the human race with all the strange and mysterious developments of its history, proclaim no ever-present, all-governing and sustaining, all-controlling and directing power, supremely intelligent, wise, mighty and good. They discover nothing here but the soulless movements and oscillations of a vast machine, which, in all its intricate mechanism, they conceive, indeed, to have been originally devised and produced by the creator God, but which has, as they hold, been abandoned by him to its necessary and regular developments and evolutions, following each other in a fixed series, from an inherent necessity, and determined by absolute and unalterable laws. And they illustrate their doctrine by such analogies as these, the worthlessness of which shall be pointed out hereafter. "The seed, having the vegetative power in itself, is cast by the husbandman into the soil, and these, aided merely by natural agencies, it is left to develop itself into the full-grown plant or tree. The watch, complete in its wheels and mainspring, is wound up, and continues to move, though ever so far distant from the maker. The ship-builder, having finished and launched the ship, leaves it entirely to the care of the sailors. Such are specimens of some of the analogies by which men would exclude God from his own world, and make the universe, if not independent of his creative power, altogether independent of his presence and control." Thus naturalism knows no providence. Rational and scriptural piety "distinguishes the great intelligent spirit from the material world which he pervades, while it acknowledges his presence and energy acting upon all secondary causes as the primary action of the whole. Hence the ample room which such a system opens for the outgoings of a grateful and lofty devotion. Hence its firm faith in the well-attested divine interpositions of the past, and its expectation that, if need be, similar interpositions will take place in the future."

Naturalism denies all this. It denounces it as the progeny of ignorance and fanaticism. It demolishes it at once, just as a man on awakening, demolishes the airy castles which he

built during sleep. If naturalism admits of a special and supernatural interference at all, it restricts such an interference to the original act of creation. The Almighty is allowed to come forth, create, give life, set in motion, and look on the scene, but afterwards he retires, and leaves the whole to nature and nature's laws. All the phenomena of matter and mind, however rich and magnificent, all the events of history, however influential and unprecedented, all the changes that have taken place in nations and individuals, however thorough and beneficent, have, according to this system, occurred in a merely natural way, just as the engine speeds along the line of rail by the natural force of steam."—p. 100.

Thus, then, naturalism reads the history of the universe, by which we mean all the phenomena and developments of existence since the creation, chaptered off into astronomy, geology, natural science, political history, progress of civilization, philosophy, &c., with an intensely zealous determination to exclude from it the agency, the interposition of God, as supreme governor, as though his very touch were pollution. The lofty praises of the supreme and beneficent ruler of the world, the dispenser of the blessings of the varied year, that ring in heaven-born song and harmony divine, through the inspired strains of the old covenant saints, from Moses down to the latest prophet, are nothing but rhapsodical effusions of poetic license. He who spake as never man spake, is regarded as accommodating his teachings to the crude notions of his ignorant contemporaries, when he points to the fowls of the air and the lilies of the field, as witnesses of the constant and superintending goodness of the almighty Father in heaven. "Miracles are impossible, just because they are unnatural. And what in theology is called the doctrine of divine influence, is a mystery, a thing supernatural, and therefore not to be believed." The calamities that befall individuals, families, communities and nations, their moral regeneration and improvement, the revolutions that shake nations, empires and continents, upheaving old institutions and bringing in a new order of things, all these developments are nothing more than a natural order of sequences in a necessary process of affairs dependent upon fixed laws inherent in nature and in mind." Man is to effect an apotheosis for himself, by the hopeful process of exhausting his corruption. And should it take a long series of ages, vices and woes, to reach this glorious attainment, patience may sustain itself the while by the thought, that when it is realized, it will be burdened with no duty of religious gratitude. No time is too long to wait, no cost too deep to incur, for the triumph

of proving that we have no need of a divinity, regarded as possessing that one attribute which makes it delightful to acknowledge such a being, the benevolence that would make us happy. But even if this noble self-sufficiency cannot be realized, the independence of spirit which has labored for it must not sink at last into piety. This afflicted world, 'this poor terrestrial citadel of man,' is to lock its gates, and keep its miseries, rather than admit the degradation of receiving help from God."—p. 102 sq.

Mr. Pearson gives a brief history of this form of infidelity, from the ancient atomists and Epicureans down to Auguste Comte and other living infidel philosophers; as our subject is very extensive, we must omit all further notice of this historic sketch, and pass on to a work that appeared in England several years ago, creating quite an excitement every where, and provoking elaborate replies from men of science, both in Europe and this country. The work is entitled: "Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation." As this production is instinct throughout with the most undisguised and unscrupulous naturalism, it will be well here to present Mr. Pearson's succinct resumé of its contents. "The theory is one of those extreme systems of development, according to which the world, with all its varied phenomena, moves on in its stern necessary course, guided only by physical laws, to the exclusion of the divine agency. It assumes the nebular hypothesis which, resting originally on insufficient data, is falling more and more into discredit, as science steadily advances—and from the nebulous matter of space, which 'must have been a universal fire-mist,' it evolves, on the principle of pure physical law, the whole system of worlds. This universal fire-mist being granted, we have, as it were, the original germ of the material universe. The germ may have been created by God, and have received from him its first impulse, but out of itself, and solely through the operation of physical laws, have been gradually unfolded those forms of magnificence and beauty which we see in the heavens and the earth. The theory may admit of a divine interposition in calling the original constituents of the universe into existence, but it dispenses with, or extrudes all divine interposition in giving to matter its wondrous and richly-varied collocations. It may allow God in the beginning to utter his fiat, summon matter forth in its shapeless form from the void, and impress on it certain laws, but it allows not the creator henceforth to interfere with his creation, or even to touch any of its springs of motion, so that, after the first creating act, he might as well have ceased to be. The universe,

according to this theory of naturalism, has moved on in its glorious path of evolution, from the hour of the creation of the nebulae, without the interposition of God; his existence and agency being deemed necessary to give it beginning, but not necessary to fashion, dispose, continue and control it. To the questions, whence this universal fire-mist, this nebulous matter, diffused throughout space, and the natural laws with which it has been endowed, you may get the answer, 'from God.' But you get no such answer when you ask who fashioned matter into such grand and beautiful forms, and disposed them so orderly and beneficially. The Most High seems now to have abdicated, and to have enthroned the physical laws, and left them to mould and govern the worlds. The Bible, in its sublime simplicity, tells us that 'God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night: he made the stars also.' But the author of the 'Vestiges' declares, the masses of space are formed by law; law makes them in due time theatres of existence for plants and animals.' 'It is impossible,' he says, 'to suppose a distinct exertion or fiat of almighty power for the formation of the earth, wrought up as it is in a complex dynamical connection, first with Venus on the one hand, and Mars on the other, and secondly with all the other members of the system.' And not only so, but he endeavors to interpret the first chapter of Genesis so as to discountenance 'special efforts of the deity.' The sublime expression, 'Let light be,' indicates no special interposition of the great creator, but merely a process of law. And such statements as, God made the firmament, God made the beast of the earth, &c., are said 'to occur subordinately . . . not necessarily to convey a different idea of the mode of creation, and indeed only appear as alternative phrases in the usual duplicative style of the east.' This is naturalism without a cloak."—p. 109 sqq.

We cannot follow Mr. Pearson in his elaborate discussion of the general principles of this very ingenious, and yet very silly book, and in his remarks upon the nebular hypothesis: a hypothesis which the progress of discovery has greatly discredited, and will probably eventually explode completely. We have a few words to say upon the manner in which this work and kindred productions employ and apply the term *law*: *physical laws*. The laws of the universe which are, in the systems of such writers, omnipotent, in themselves efficient and competent to the production of compact worlds out of fire-mist, of perfect animals out of microscopic monads or embryotic points, and of man, endowed with thinking mind and

feeling heart, and moral sense, and glorious gift of speech, out of monkeys, themselves forth-struggled through long ages of patient ambition, out of the monads aforesaid: these laws, let us remember, work out these great results, achieve their wondrous effects, in utter independence of the Almighty. He is of so little consequence to their operation, that He might as well not be. And as we are very coolly expected to accept this sweeping proposition, this bold development-theory, as exhibiting the only rational explanation of the endless stages and varieties of existence, we are certainly justifiable in asking, what do you mean by law? What distinct, well defined idea do you mean to convey by this term, physical laws? A law is a principle expressed in the form of a requirement or command: it is a precept, a rule of action, carried into effect, and requiring an agent to render it operative. Without an executor, possessing authority and power to put it in force, a law is an abstraction: if written, a dead letter: if spoken, mere *verbum volans*. In the proper sense of the word, a law can have reference only to intelligence, can address itself only to intelligence, can be reduced to practice only by intelligence. Hence that universal fire-mist must, if obedient to law, either have possessed an intelligent spirit, or the infinitely intelligent, wise and almighty creator must have conducted its developments, by his own pervading and efficient presence. But, lest we should be accused of dealing in specious cavils, we accept, as just and proper, the application of the term law to denote the immediate and efficient cause of certain effects, produced under certain circumstances: we do not take exception to the terms, law of cohesion, of gravitation, of elective affinity, of definite proportions, &c., &c. We go further and admit, that God has so constituted things, that, whenever certain relations occur or subsist, certain results invariably follow,¹ and that it is a law laid down by Him, that so it should be, without his setting himself to work (reverently be it spoken) as men do, to give effect to the law laid down; so that, e. g., when we choose to apply a lighted match to the touch-hole of a loaded cannon, the almighty needs not bestir himself to project, by a special act, the ball in a given direction and velocity; or that, when we deposit a grain of corn in the earth, he needs not busy himself, by immediate agency, to quicken the germ, un-

¹ Invariably, as a general rule: there are exceptions, which, though they confirm the rule, also show that the alleged laws are not omnipotent, but that there is a power superior to them.

fold the plant, and ripen the ear. We admit that things transpire and go on according to certain established and regular tendencies which God has put into them, and which, from their efficiency and uniform action, men call laws. But when we are told that these laws are sufficient in themselves, and entirely independent of the creator, the law-giver, we cannot help ourselves, but only obey a law put into our mind, when we ask, what do you mean? Are you not confounding the laws with their effective enforcement by the executive power? Do you mean that these laws are essential properties of matter, appertaining to it by an inherent necessity, so that they develop themselves, and exercise their energies spontaneously, in consequence of certain relations? Scarcely the latter; for, so far as we can understand you, the effect of the laws is, to modify and determine the relations: the laws of gravitation and projection determine the orbit of a planet around its sun: the law of development causes certain embryotic points to unfold themselves into plants and trees, and, if we are to believe you, impels the ape, himself whilom an embryotic point, to become a man. The laws, therefore, dwell in the things themselves. What, then, are they? According to your theory they must be potential factors, motive agencies, or active forces. There must be an active, efficient force in the sun, compelling e. g. the earth towards its (the sun's) centre: there must be an active, efficient force in the earth, compelling the earth away from the sun's centre: the combined action of the two forces (called laws in the system of naturalism) drives the earth in a certain orbit round the sun. Now we, as well as you, call this the law of the earth's motion. But a law, unless we talk at random and use unmeaning language, implies intelligence, design, wisdom, adaptation. Is matter intelligent? Has it conscious aims? Is it wise to adapt means to the attainment of its ends? After the original, universal fire-mist had, by a gradual process of consolidation, been broken up into vast nebulae, and when the nebula in which we have the deepest practical interest, resolved itself into the glorious sun and its attendant planets and satellites, which constitute our solar system (such being your primordial history of our system), those planets began to revolve, and have ever since revolved around their common centre, with a regularity of motion so precise, as to admit of the nicest calculations as respects their whereabouts at any given future. Philosophers tell us, that this results from the combined action of gravitation and propulsion, of the centripetal and centrifugal or projectile forces, and that these are the laws of planetary motion. And these laws, we

are now told, reside in the bodies themselves; and the whole process, from the first gradual beginnings of resolvment in the fire-mist into distinct consolidations, down to the complete evolution and perpetually regular movements of distinct systems having their own central suns, is the necessary effect of laws originally deposited in the fire-mist, and independently of their author working out their necessary results. Or again: I ascend to a very high elevation, and extend my hand, holding a ten pound weight over a perpendicular precipice: I withdraw my hand from under the weight, and it falls to the ground with great and accelerated velocity. You tell me it must do so: it must obey the law of gravitation; and I have nothing to say against your explanation: I do not question its correctness. But when you tell me in respect of all these phenomena, the evolution and movements of solar systems, the falling of bodies towards the earth's centre, that God has nothing at all to do with the matter: that all this results independently of him, from the action of fixed laws inherent in matter itself, I come again with my still unanswered question, what do you mean? We repeat, a law is no force: a law is nothing without an agent to give it effect: as a law it exists only in the legislator's mind, or in the statute-book: to produce effects, it requires an efficient agent, having authority and power to put it in force. You can, then, only mean, that there is a certain fixed order in the universe, according to which these and all other phenomena are, and under given conditions, must be thus, and not otherwise. But when you tell me that these laws reside in matter, and operate in absolute independence of the creator, I do not understand you. These are manifestations, phenomena of an established order; but the law decreeing, determining, establishing this order thus and not otherwise, must be the fiat of one will, and reside in the infinitely intelligent divine mind; and although this order rolls on in a manner seemingly quite mechanical from year to year, and from century to century, it must, of course, depend upon the governing law being continued in existence and efficient operation, in and by the divine mind where it originated, and where alone it can reside. For, suppose that the divine mind should at any time simply cease to will the continuance of those physical laws, should simply stop concerning itself about the universe: would, think you, that order continue? Does that infinite intelligence and wisdom which are exhibited in the order of the universe, marvellously balancing and harmonizing a countless multitude of forces and their respective developments, exist in matter so independently of the divine will, that

the results would be the same, whether God willed or ceased to will? If we understand you correctly, your organ of credulity is large enough to believe this, and this is actually your position. Well then, suppose again, that the divine will should positively determine, and issue the fiat, that the order of the universe shall cease, nay, that the universe itself shall cease to exist: would the universe bid him defiance, and, in plenary independence, resolve to keep up its established order, and accordingly carry out its resolution? Here we are at the point of decision, and it matters nothing whether you carefully weigh your answer or not: it must be either yes or no: and either way, you are in an unenviable predicament: if you say no, then you have simply abandoned your theory, and it will be time to think of another: if your answer be in the affirmative, then you have only thrown off your cloak, and your theory is not naturalism, but atheism. For, if God is the original creator, then is He also the governor of the universe, and the preserver of its order, or He is not at all. More of this presently. But, if the established order of the universe in all its phenomena depends upon the divine mind, willing that that order shall subsist, and if the divine will could at once abrogate that order, and even annihilate the universe, then the *laws* which determine, govern and regulate all the phenomena of the universe, exist in the divine mind, and do *not* reside in the things themselves; and then the manner in which you naturalists talk of the physical laws of the universe, is pure, unadulterated nonsense. If you should here object, that this is mere logomachy: that what we designate as the order of the universe, you term its laws, we maintain that the distinction upon which we insist is all important to the question at issue: we are *not* disputing about words: we do not object to the ordinary use of the term, natural laws, or, physical laws of the universe: it is the manner of its application that we object: the difference between us is, that while we contend that the so-called laws of the universe are dependent upon and subject to the divine will, which can interfere with or abrogate them at pleasure, you put them in the place of God, excluding him utterly from his creation. The phenomena of the material world may all observe a certain fixed order; but matter can neither make laws nor put them in force: it can only obey them, subject to the will of Him who made them. But you will reply, that you do not assert, that matter evolves or makes its own laws, but that you admit, that they were given to it, deposited in it, by the creator. But with this admission you do one of two things: you either assert that laws are forces, active pow-

ers, by inherent efficient energy gradually and regularly effecting, through immense cycles of time, great results foreseen and aimed at from the beginning, which is nonsense; or you give up your position, that the laws of the universe operate, and effect their results, independently of the creator, and in no way subject to his interference or control. For, unless you are materialists, and therefore atheists: if you believe at all in a creator, infinite in knowledge, wisdom, power and goodness, then you must believe that creation, the whole wide universe, has no independent existence, and would instantly cease to be, if the creator should so decree, or simply cease to will its existence: and if its very existence is dependent on his will, certainly its mode, form, or manner of existence must be equally so. For, to will a thing, without willing what and how it is to be, is an absurdity.¹ And hence, while we distinctly admit that the universe is, on the whole, subject to a certain fixed order, and while we do not object to your ascribing this to the laws of the universe, we must maintain that these laws have no existence except in the divine mind, and that, if the divine will ceased to animate and uphold them, they would cease to be.

There is another consideration to be taken into account here. If everything in the universe develops itself according to some fixed law, which law is thus the necessary condition to every distinct class or series of objects, not only of its existence, but of its mode of existence, and if no supernatural interference with the operation of such law is admissible, then, of course, the authority of the law is absolute, and in any given class or series of objects, the developments must be constantly and uniformly the same: deviations are impossible: abnormal developments are out of the question; for an order once absolutely and imperatively fixed, no longer admits of freedom of development. If this conclusion is denied, what then becomes of the independent and all-sufficient energy of that inherent necessity, which the advocates of this theory designate as law? If in any one single instance the law becomes inoperative, or only partially so, and an extraordinary, unforeseen development takes place, the chain of necessity is broken, and the law, alleged to be in itself supreme and absolutely efficient, is dishonored; and then, unless we can look to a power superior to the established order of things, to a supreme law-giver who

¹ Of course, the mysteries of the moral world do not here enter into consideration at all: the divine government and the existence of moral evil, together constitute a great mystery, about which philosophy has speculated, but which it has never solved, and never can more than hypothetically solve.

has the authority and the power to modify at pleasure the operation of his laws, or so to constitute things as to admit of a great degree of freedom of development, in subservency to ends distinct and clear before his own mind, we are all adrift, in a mist of perplexing uncertainty. But if our conclusion is assented to, and the uniform operation of physical laws insisted upon, then indeed our perplexity is unbounded and irremediable: then innumerable diversities of development in the physical universe, and those phenomena which, for want of a better term, have been called *lusus nature*, must be either entirely ignored, or simply set aside as out of the pale of law, as lawless interlopers which wantonly break the established uniformity, and disturb the universal harmony. But we are quite too obtuse to comprehend, what thus becomes of the imperative and absolutely efficient laws of the universe. We do not understand where this host of interlopers come from, and if we did, we could not understand why the omnipotent physical laws did not strangle them in the birth. For surely these laws have it all their own way, free from every interposing power: why then do they not effectually exercise their authority, to put down every non-conformist? But seriously, the consideration upon which we desire here to insist, is this, that the operation of physical laws is by no means as harmonious and uniform as naturalists would have us believe. So far as human observation goes, this perfect harmony, this complete uniformity prevails only in the movements of the heavenly bodies. But in the affairs, in the physical phenomena of this our earth, it is widely different. Doubtless the divine adjustment of physical nature is so admirable as to prove the operation of general laws, highly beneficial in their effects. But the world is replete with distinct and isolated developments and phenomena, in which no fixed order can be pointed out, and which are referable to no ascertained law, so that they cannot be foreseen or guarded against by any human sagacity. "They are the result, not so much of any general law, as of the unexpected crossing or clashing, contact or collision, of two or more general laws."¹ And supposing even the effect of such collision to correspond, in a degree, with frequent experiences, is it one of the general laws of the universe, that these laws shall clash and collide? If not, who directs and controls the circumstances which lead to such crossings and collisions? In the production of such effects or phenomena, secondary causes

¹ Cf. on this subject, "The Method of the Divine Government, physical and moral," by Rev. James M'Cosh, who enters into its discussion far more extensively and elaborately than we have space to do.

are, of course, brought into action; but, while in the heavens uniform results are produced by the uniform action of established laws, it is different here; and though, under the same circumstances, the same causes produce, by divine appointment, the same effects, altered circumstances or conditions greatly modify, often completely change the operation of causes. And this is preëminently the case in respect of "those departments of God's works which bear the closest relations to man:" and the more nearly they affect him, the greater is the contingency and the uncertainty. Meteorological phenomena, atmospheric changes, the action of light, of heat, of the elasticity of vapors, of electricity; frequent and violent changes on the earth's surface: slight derangements of the complex organism of the human frame, resulting in sickness, insanity, or death; of whatever laws we may here witness the compound operation, who dares deny that contingencies, circumstances or conditions referable to no law, here produce effects bearing the appearance of accident, and seemingly transpiring in the most complicated confusion. While infidels talk, in this connexion, of chance and fate, as the only Dii whom their machina can produce, we do not object to the words chance and accident as currently used, so long as they are employed merely to denote that the events thus designated are unforeseen and out of the regular order. It is "these unforeseen accidents, which so often control the lot of man, that constitute a superstratum of human affairs, wherein peculiarly the divine providence holds empire for the accomplishment of its special purposes. It is from this hidden and inexhaustible mine of all chances, as we must call them, that the governor of the world draws, with unfathomable skill, the materials of his dispensation towards each individual of mankind." (Isaac Taylor: *Nat. Hist. of Enthusiasm*). If these considerations are well founded—and who will presume to question them?—what becomes of the autocratic operation of physical laws, independent of the creator and supreme ruler, which form the basis of the naturalistic system?

But the author of the 'Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation' applies, as he needs must, his development-theory also to organic creatures, and derives their perfect existence from monads, embryotic points, through a self-determining process of development in accordance with the law of their nature. For a most able confutation of this most absurd theory, upon well ascertained principles of natural science, and from facts brought to light by geology, we must refer the reader to Mr. Pearson's Essay, to Mr. Hugh Miller's "Footprints of the Cre-

ator," to the Rev. Dr. King's work entitled : "The Principles of Geology explained and viewed in their relations to revealed and natural religion (p. 101 sqq.), and to other works of a similar character. The subject is one of great importance and of profound interest; and, although the temptation to expatiate is very strong, our limits bid us forbear. Suffice it here to say, that, without any appeal to the authority of scripture, this development-hypothesis, when examined in the light of true science, proves to be nothing more than a gratuitous assumption, "the baseless fabric of a vision." But there is one aspect of this subject which, though we have never seen it alluded to by any of the able writers who have so successfully combated this absurd theory, yet seems to us well worthy of consideration. This development-process of higher animals and of man out of monads or embryotic points, grew out of the law of the nature of these monads or points. Is this law still in force and operation? Then there ought to be tangible evidence of the fact. Has it ceased to operate? Did it, in the beginning, produce one pair of each species of organized creatures, and not another since? Then must the creator have once at least come forth from his seclusion, in order to abrogate that wonder working law. But as our naturalist philosophers can, of course, not accept this latter alternative, we may at once dismiss it and hold fast to the former. The question has often forced itself upon our mind: how is it, that this development-process, and this transmutation of species, is never witnessed at some stage of its progress? Did the ambition to struggle upward into higher organizations possess monads only at the beginning, when the great, original, fabulous fire-mist first broke up? Is not the world now full of monadic animalcules, as capable of developing themselves into lizards, or water fowl, or monkeys, as those of sixty thousand years ago? Are not the apes of the present day as likely to covet the human form and organism, and have they not the same capacity and privilege of forth-struggling into humanhood, as the first monkeys that accomplished this great achievement? If not, then, as we have said above, the great law-giver must have interposed, and stopped the process after its first successful achievements. But if so, if the law be still in force, how comes it that no mortal, from father Adam down to the author of the "Vestiges," has ever detected any creature in its transition state, any ganoid passing over into a gigantic form: any infusorial point developing itself into a monkey: any monkey writhing and wriggling over into the form and stature of humanity? These writers tell us, indeed, that the process is immensely gradual, requiring vast

periods of time for its completion. Even then, however, if not entirely stopped, it would be subject to detection. If thus to develop themselves be the law of the nature of monads, infusorial animalcules, &c., the process must be constantly going on; and then, though we could not see or hear them grow, we could not fail to find multitudes of subjects at some stage of their transition-state, one-eighth, one-quarter, half, three quarters, or nearly quite developed. But this hypothesis of immense gradualness is as much a fiction as any other part of the theory. For naturalists (we mean here men who study natural history in a rational way) have conclusively shown, that these gradual metamorphoses are impossible: the required intermediate stages between the extreme points, the monad and the perfectly evolved animal, fish, or bird, are impossible states of existence. The great Cuvier says: "No deviation in the ordinary form of the cuttle-fish, has ever produced, or can constitute a being placed beneath it; nor can, or ever will, its better development give rise to a series of animals of a more perfect species, to be classed immediately above it." Any number of instances illustrating this principle of organic nature, might be given. Take one more: "The hare lives above ground, sheltering among brakes and bushes. The young of this timid animal are enabled to run after the dam immediately after birth. On the other hand, the rabbit excavates a subterranean abode, where it brings forth its young, which are at first blind and helpless, and there nurses them until they have strength. The young rabbit becomes an individual of a social establishment, while the solitary hare seeks protection for itself alone; and between these alternatives there is no medium."—(King, p. 106.) The first human pair, we are expected to believe, were ambitious apes, whose innate and resistless desire to become human, wrought out its legitimate result. We cannot but admire the happy coincidence, that two apes, male and female, should just at the same time have achieved the aim of their lofty aspirations, and that too in localities sufficiently contiguous to ensure their union as man and wife. But the grand difficulty in the way of this development of apes into men and women, is, that it *could* not have been gradual: that it *must* have been effected per saltum. "The nature of the changes supposed, does not admit that they should in general be diminutive. An example will best illustrate and establish this observation. A hand or foot must be one or other of these organs distinctively; in other words, it must be adapted for clasping or walking. To change the one of these into the other would

necessarily be a great metamorphosis, and there is no conceivable way of subdividing it into degrees. Besides, a single alteration of corporeal structure may change the general conditions of life, and render the re-casting of a whole animal indispensable to its preservation. This is the well known law of the correlation of organs. Remove the proboscis of an elephant, and how many other alterations become necessary before the creature can satisfy its hunger and thirst?" (King, p. 106 sq.) Thus, as we might further most copiously illustrate, the objectionableness and the difficulties of this development-theory are not at all got rid of by by graduating the process, and thus rendering it, if possible, more impracticable than if it were claimed to be sudden—per saltum. And certainly, be it gradual or sudden, we are entitled to be informed, why and how it happens, that no evidences are furnished of the continuance of the process. There can be no reason alleged, except the interference of the creator, which is, however, utterly repudiated, why the ambitious aspirations for a higher organism and life should have been confined to a few primitive monads, or infusorial animalcules, or why, in this age of progress, ambitious apes, coveting the form and organism of humanity, should not, at highly advanced stages of development, sympathetically seek the haunts of men, and before our eyes shuffle off the coil of monkeyhood, and stand forth in all the beauty and dignity of human kind, still unpolluted by sin, undebased by vice and wickedness. If any such marvels there be, let them be produced, that we may regale our eyes with one huge stare of childish wonder, and that Barnum may be rendered happy beyond expression by additions to his museum that will leave him nothing more to desire. We may have to revert hereafter to the strange notions of this writer.

But it is time to return to Mr. Pearson. He bestows a brief notice upon Humboldt's "Cosmos," passing upon it a series of appropriate strictures, and stating, what is known to all acquainted with that brilliant work, that, in respect of Providence, its sins are those of omission: it does not very directly promulgate infidel views, but it utterly ignores the creator and his government of the world. Indeed, the distinguished author seems to have considered it necessary to notify his readers, at the outset, of the stand-point from which he intended to consider the universe: "In reflecting upon physical phenomena and events, and tracing their causes by the process of reason, we become more and more convinced of the truth of the ancient doctrine, that the forces inherent in matter, and those which govern the moral world, exercise their action under the

control of primordial necessity, and in accordance with movements occurring periodically after longer or shorter intervals." Upon this declaration Mr. Pearson very justly remarks: "The illustrious German, after having travelled over a considerable portion of the earth's surface, and made himself acquainted with all that is at present known of the physical phenomena of the universe, thus acknowledges, in the midst of his four-score years, no higher agency than material forces, acting under the government of a primordial necessity. Divine providence is thus interdicted, and this goodly universe moves onward, unfolding its forms of life and grandeur, without the hand of Him that made it. This may consist with Hegelianism, or with some other form of the transcendental philosophy, but it does not consist with the deeper philosophy of man's inward nature. It *might* do if we had heads and no hearts. The intellect may rest in it for a while, but the soul with its capacities and cravings cannot repose there for a moment. Our very heart-strings must be torn out, the emotional part of our nature must be overborne, and all our upward aspirations repressed, before we can be satisfied with this thing of fate, this primordial necessity, in the room of the living and ever-ruling God. Even in an æsthetic view, this method of philosophizing stands condemned. Robert Hall has truly said: 'The exclusion of a supreme being and of a superintending providence, tends directly to the destruction of moral taste. It robs the universe of all finished and consummate excellence, even in idea.' p. 121.

Our author next reviews a work, well known in this country, where many editions of it have been issued and rapidly sold: Combe's "Constitution of Man."¹ This book is written in a popular style, as it was intended expressly to enlighten the masses, to rescue the natural laws from the hands of ignorance and superstition, and to set forth their operations in a clear light. While Mr. Combe has undeniably done this in a great measure, and has thus contributed to the promotion of that public movement towards improved sanitary regulations, which is one of the most cheering features of our age, he has done incalculable evil, by taking, as it were, the natural laws out of the hands of the superintending law giver, and preserving a studied silence about God as working in and by them. Mr. Combe and his school have, however, gone further than this. They constantly talk about natural laws in that absurd manner upon

¹ We here follow Mr. Pearson in the general train of remark, but, except where we directly quote him or some other writer, in our own manner and language, as our limits make it necessary that we should condense.

which we have animadverted above, intimating that these laws are all in all, and that God does not interfere with their operations. Mr. Combe not only "overlooks altogether that adjustment of natural laws to each other, whereby the results are often of the most complicated character, and such that they cannot be anticipated by any human foresight;"¹ but "he has completely overlooked the ambiguity which lurks in the word law, and used it in all the divers senses of which it is capable, predicating of a law in one sense what is true of it only in another. Sometimes he means by it a property of matter, sometimes a cause requiring the adjustment of two or more substances to each other: at other times a general fact originating in the adjustment of causes, and anon he denotes by it a moral precept enjoined by God. With the greatest coolness and self-complacency he uses the word law in all these senses, without ever dreaming that there is any difference between them, constantly asserting of a general fact what is true only of a property of matter, and of a physical cause what holds good only of a moral precept."¹ How can any dependence be placed upon the speculations and conclusions of a man who blunders so desperately in fundamentals? But if, as Combe maintains, it is unquestionably "the extreme of superstition and fanaticism, to repose implicit faith in divine providence, while neglecting or going counter to the clearly defined laws of the human constitution, or those which regulate the physical and moral worlds," it is just as obviously "rushing," as Mr. Pearson well observes, "to a godless extreme, the extreme of naturalism, to rest in some secondary agencies without rising upward to Him who touches all the springs of action, or to ignore his presence in and superintendence over the world. If it is "confessedly mysterious how human instrumentality and divine agency blend in bringing about events," Mr. Combe greatly errs, if he imagines that the mystery is lessened by severing the link that connects the two together: by loosening our hold of the heavens above, and attaching ourselves exclusively to the earth and the things therein. "Is the world's history, or is individual history less mysterious, by shutting out from the sphere of human things the divine providence, and leaving room for nothing but the operation of natural laws? Or rather, is not all history, by such an exclusion, made much more mysterious than ever? In the one case, we have the human agency moving freely under the moral control of the divine, we have in full play the elements of human action

¹ McCosh on "the divine government," p. 194.

and piety, and yet mysterious relations. In the other case, we have only the human agent and the physical and moral laws, we have excluded the hand of God and taken away the elements of piety, and still the relations are mysterious. The choice then lies between a mysterious world, in which God is ever present and ever felt, and a mysterious world that moves onward in its glorious evolutions without his continued agency. He is the better philosopher and the happier man who prefers the former, and holds a key to things inscrutable, which can never be solved by the man who chooses the latter." Pearson, p. 123 sq.

Mr. Combe, in announcing his views, exhibits a large measure of that self-complacency which characterizes that mixed multitude of self-elected reformers who, in our day, infest society as well in the church as in the state, and who deem themselves called to wage war upon truths and institutions, for no other or better reason than that they have come down to us through the lapse of centuries: his reformatory operations are on a large scale. According to him, the doctrine of human depravity is a very unphilosophical crotchet: that christianity is "a system of spiritual influences, of internal operations on the soul," is an opinion that can be maintained only by ignoramuses—such, we suppose, as St. Paul, Augustine, Luther, Calvin, Chalmers, Edwards, Hall, and a host of others:—prayer is of no use whatever (how can it be, if God has forsaken the world?) except in its reflex influence on the mind of the petitioner: death is not at all the penal effect of man's first disobedience, but "a natural institution;" and in view of all this, the religious instructors of mankind have need to be taught over again; i. e. to sit at the feet of the philosophical phrenologist, George Combe, so that "a new direction may be given to their pursuits."

Writers of this class, when speaking of natural phenomena, labor under a twofold illusion. On the first we have already expressed ourselves in extenso, viz: that the laws of nature are not modes of the divine procedure, but real and independent existences. The other is, that they suppose that because things happen according to fixed laws, the divine agency cannot be in them. Now, not to insist upon the utter repugnance of such views to scripture, they are, as a philosophy, extremely superficial and unsound. This could be readily demonstrated and strikingly illustrated; but we leave this for the reader himself to do, and merely quote a few sentences from Mr. Morell's "History of Modern Philosophy." Speaking of secondary agencies, he very justly remarks: "They are all un-

der the *moral control* of Deity from first to last, so that the penalty, which seems at first to be simply the result of breaking a natural law, is really an effect of that providential power which governs the world." And what he says of the world's history may, as Mr. Pearson remarks, be said of the history of many a community and individual : "To the man who looks unbelievably upon divine providence, the world's history is a problem that can never be solved." What Mr. Pearson says of Combe's view of prayer, we quote in extenso : "Combe's view of prayer—bolstered up though it be by such names as Lord Kames, Dr. Hugh Blair, and Professor Leechman, men of no high authority, verily, in such matters—stands condemned also as most unnatural, not to say most unscriptural. It is, indeed, quite of a piece with his philosophy, but it consists not with the deeper philosophy of the heart and the Bible. Men have never prayed under the persuasion that the sole efficacy of prayer is reflex, that it has an influence only on the mind of the worshipper. The wisest and best of the Greeks and Romans, the unsophisticated children of the desert, as well as the most enlightened and devout christians, have resorted to prayer under the conviction that it is effectual to secure blessings directly from above. The reflex influence of prayer is valuable, but the value is realized just in proportion as the heart goes out after the direct influence. A rational theory it truly is, which would thus make the value of men's devotions to arise from men's illusions ! The reflex influence supposes the direct influence, and for men to enjoy the former without faith in the latter, resembles, as Isaac Taylor remarks, "the supposition that we might continue to enjoy the accommodation of moonlight, even if the sun were blotted from the planetary system."

As to the stale objection, which is ever and anon brought forth, that the direct influence of prayer supposes that we can alter the divine determinations, it is sufficient to reply, that it is according to these determinations that men must ask, in order to receive, and knock in order to the door being opened. God discloses unto us the treasures of his grace, and says, 'I will yet for these be inquired of.'

It is necessary that we should be brief in our survey of what still remains to be noticed under this phase of infidelity. We would simply notify the reader, that we shall here employ the terms "naturalism" and "rationalism" indiscriminately, not only with reference to the explanation given at the beginning of this article, but because the principles of this school have been freely applied in the explanation of scripture, in the

manner of the German rationalists, who, if they still deserved much consideration, would belong under the category now before us.

The doctrines which Combe has taught in his peculiar and insidious manner, have been openly avowed and audaciously promulgated by the Owen school. Defining rationalism to be the science of material circumstances, "the philosophy of Owenism ignores everything else. It denounces other systems for having spiritualized man, and it professes to look upon him, to all practical purposes, as a material being. Humanity, in its estimation, contains within itself the germs of indefinite moral improvement, and needs only to be brought under the genial influences of earth to ripen into perfection. Supernatural aid is interdicted at the threshold, lest it should beget an indifference to self-exertion, and foster a habit of dependence. The first and last lesson given to its disciples, is, that men's opinions and actions result exclusively from their original susceptibilities, and the influence of the world around them, over which they have no control. Hence its oft-repeated injunction, study yourself, and mind external circumstances. This is the sum and substance of its commandments. It admits the existence of error and vice in humanity, for these are too palpable to be denied, but it charitably calls them misfortunes, and, as a remedy for all moral ills, insists on a rational education." (Pearson, p. 129 sq.) Mr. Pearson enters into a pretty full, and most satisfactory confutation of what the Owen school propounds as philosophy: were it not that its views are widely disseminated in hundreds of little pamphlets, the effect of which it is desirable to counteract, we should consider the notice which it receives as conferring upon it a great deal too much honor. - We cannot follow our author in this discussion; but we will cite, and very briefly comment upon, a few of the dogmatical assertions (utterly guiltless as they are of all philosophy) which Mr. Owen puts forth, calling them "fundamental facts." The first he states thus: "Man is a compound being, whose character is formed of his constitution or organization at birth, and of the effects of external circumstances upon it from birth to death; such original organization and external influences continually acting and reacting each upon the other." Now, if this meant only, that man, having certain natural endowments, and acted upon by external influences, which call them into action and provoke their development, unfolds his character according to the position which he assumes with reference to the external objective reality which acts upon him, it would be nothing more than a truism, which

nobody would dispute ; and then, unless it be susceptible of demonstration, that man is so constituted from his birth as to have no self-determination, no free will, the doctrine is useless and leads to nothing : it can be turned to no account in that wonderful reformation which these profound philosophers propose to effect in the moral world : it leaves us just where we were before. But if their meaning be, that man's organization is entirely material, and that its phenomenal developments are produced by the action of the external material world upon it, then, flying in the face of all observation and experience, they boldly take for granted what they are bound to prove : they are simply materialists who deal in a strange perversion of language, when they talk of man's mental and moral constitution and of moral reform.

Nor is there a particle more of reason or common sense in Mr. Owen's second "*fundamental fact*," that "Man is compelled by his original constitution to receive his feelings and convictions independently of his will." This foolish doctrine is based upon the undeniable facts, that processes of reasoning follow certain laws, and that, certain premises being given, the human mind can, according to the laws of its own constitution, draw only one certain conclusion ; and that, further, human belief is necessarily dependent upon certain conditions, and that, according to a law of our nature, the will determines and impels us to action, only when moved to this by convictions and feelings or emotions : from these facts the absurd inference is drawn, that man is therefore nothing but a material machine, which must believe and will in accordance with fixed necessity. The falsity of this doctrine is too palpable to need an elaborate refutation : any sophomore can see through its flimsiness. The system has three more "*fundamental facts*," of equally ingenious invention, and the same relation to the truth : the reader will find them all most effectually disposed of in Morell's "History of Modern Philosophy," p. 293. sqq., from which we here quote in full, the third "*fact*," with Mr. Morell's most satisfactory refutation : The "*fact*" is thus stated : "Our feelings or convictions, or both of them united, *create* the motive to action called the will, which stimulates him to act, and decides his actions." Upon this statement Mr. Morell remarks as follows : "To speak of feelings or convictions *creating* the will, is simply an absurdity. The will is another name for that real but mysterious power of the mind, which, in a moment, can, at its bidding, emit an energy, that leads to voluntary action or endurance. Feeling or convictions could never *create* this power, although it is quite true that they may

influence the movements of it. This being premised, the fallacious conclusion intended to be drawn from such a representation, becomes manifest. The argument implied in it is this: Our feelings and convictions *create* the will, therefore the will which is a creation of their own, cannot possibly have had any previous influence upon them. But how does the case really stand? The will is a mighty energy of a nature quite its own, which restrains or impels the whole man at its behest; created moreover, not by feelings and convictions, but by the author himself of the human mind. Our feelings and convictions act upon this power, and set it in motion; but then it at once reacts upon them, and, guided by intelligence, moulds them, to a vast extent, at its pleasure. Take a separate volition, and it is quite true that this is determined by some feeling or emotion of the mind; but we must be cautious not to confound an individual volition with *the will*, viewed as the abiding fact or principle of our spontaneity. A single volition is to the will, as a whole, what a single wave is to the ocean. Because the wind creates every wave which heaves upon the surface, is it, therefore, true that it created the ocean itself? And so, because a feeling or conviction may occasion a separate volition, is it, therefore, true that it originates the voluntary power of which this volition is but a movement? It is in the confounding of these that the source of the error we are exposing is to be found, an error which, in fact, vitiates the whole conclusion. It is not true that our feelings, or convictions, or both united, create the will, neither, if the word created be twisted so as to signify only so much as the word determine, does it follow, that because a single volition is determined by our feelings, therefore the will, taken as a whole, has no power to react upon them." The other two *facts* are of no consequence whatever, and we have bestowed so much notice upon the first three, only to show what sort of philosophy lies at the foundation of Owenism. "In fine," says Mr. Morell, "taken as a whole, it would be difficult to find any system of philosophy in an enlightened age, built upon a foundation so indefinite, so equivocal, and so utterly incapable of sustaining a superstructure of any weight, or of any durability." (p. 296 sq.) Mr. Pearson does not notice the "facts" in detail, but deals only with the views and bearings of the system in general: we shall, instead of engaging in any further discussion, quote his concluding remarks upon Owenism: "And the men of this school tell us that our characters are the necessary result of our organization at birth, and subsequent external influences over

which we have no control. 'The germs of intelligence and virtue are expanded or blasted by them,' and thus the whole human character is formed. It is not so. Our subjective constitution is not such an inert, helpless thing. We are conscious of possessing a faculty which gives us control over external circumstances; so that, taking this into account, it is true that character is the result of our subjective nature, and of the objective influences acting upon it. But in this system of naturalism, the great facts of man's moral nature are ignored. One portion of the field of phenomena is dwelt upon, as if it were the whole, and the other portion, which to a reflective mind is no less obvious, is overlooked. The eye is turned outward and lost in material things. It does not direct its glance down into the depths of human consciousness, and fails to perceive the more wondrous things of the spirit. A sense of responsibility, and moral sentiment, are great truths in the natural history of man. They are phenomena just as palpable to the eye that looks inward, as any of the material circumstances are to the eye that looks outward. But the Owen school either loses sight of these phenomena in human nature, or would assign them to a blind necessity, a source from which the unsophisticated mind refuses to receive them. Then there is the stubborn, though mysterious fact of human depravity, which it either winks at, or entirely overlooks, and for counteracting which it accordingly makes no provision. The wonder is how the abettors of such a system can read history, or look upon the world around them, without perceiving, on the one hand, how individuals and communities, placed amid the most favorable external circumstances, have continued corrupt and corrupters, and how, on the other hand, persons more unfavorably situated have, notwithstanding, become examples of virtue. A theory that ascribes so much to the mere outward relations, and leaves no room for an influence counteractive of bad ones, or efficacious to good ones, is condemned by experience as well as by religion. But perhaps its advocates would remove it from such a tribunal, by affirming that no community has ever yet been placed in such a paradisiacal state as rationalism would place it. In such a case, it must bear the double stigma of being godless and utopian." p. 132. sq.

We have yet to notice that form of naturalism which we are accustomed more particularly to designate as rationalism, and which, not exactly dealing with physical and moral science in a general way, has prosecuted its mischievous labors in the department of theology, especially under the name of Biblical Criticism. However much of this phase of infidelity may,

with different degrees of audacity, have been exhibited in this country and elsewhere, it is well known that it has all along had its chief seat in Germany, and that the land of our fathers has long enjoyed a most unenviable distinction for the impious and ruthless boldness with which laborious study and profound learning have been perverted to the wicked purpose of ejecting God, and the power of his spirit, from the volume of his own sacred word, just as the other naturalists of whom we have spoken, have labored to prove, that He has no connexion with his own creation, and nothing to do with the control and direction of its affairs. It has been the aim of German rationalism to degrade the Scriptures into mere human compositions, the works of designing and deluded men. Starting with the foregone conclusion, the arbitrary assumption, that direct revelation or supernatural influence is out of the question, and could have had nothing to do with the production of the sacred writings, rationalistic commentators have gone very coolly to work, to explain everything contained in them that referred or appealed in any way to direct divine interposition, divine revelation, divine inspiration or supernatural influence, according to natural principles, or the ordinary experience of mankind. It is true that, in pursuing their end, they are often reduced to the most pitiable shifts, which, if the subject dealt with were less serious and sacred, would be superlatively ludicrous; and that, in order to believe their explanations, a height of credulity is required utterly unattainable to minds not sublimated in the laboratory of German philosophy; but this in no wise disconcerts these philosophic homœopathists, who, regarding all belief in supernatural influence as the highest degree of superstitious credulity, seem determined to practice on the principle that *similia similibus curantur*, when they propose to cure our alleged credulity, by administering a dose of the same element potentiated into a power perfectly stunning. "The brilliant and beneficent miracles which ushered in the gospel dispensation, are exploded, or explained away on purely natural principles. And what is properly meant by divine influence, is denied a place either in the mode of inspiring the sacred writers, or in the mode of enlightening and renewing the minds of the readers. Spinoza, whose philosophy has exerted such a mighty influence on the thinking of Germany, had said, 'all that is recorded in the books of revelation, took place in conformity with the established laws of the universe.' On this principle, interpretation after interpretation has been given, until the sacred record has been swept as clear of its mighty signs and wonders, as some would sweep the starry firmament of the

evidences of an ever-present and all-controlling God. In Germany, speculative philosophy and theological doctrine are more closely linked together than in any other country in Europe. The pervading principle of its speculative philosophy, that God never intervenes specially, but that all things move on in a chain of necessary development, has been carried into the region of its theology. Hence the axiom laid down at the threshold, 'miracles are an impossibility.' The very first principle which Strauss brings to the study of the evangelists is, that when the events narrated are incompatible with known and universal laws, it must be maintained that they did not happen in the manner recorded. Divine providence is thus interdicted at the outset." (Pearson p. 134 sq.)

From all that has been thus far presented to the reader, it will be obvious what position rationalism must maintain toward the gospel. The philosophy of the rationalist denies that there was any special intervention of divine power connected with the coming of Jesus Christ, or with the production of those writings which bear record of him, and proclaim the truth as it is in him, or with the institution and establishment of his church. Of course, "therefore, his theology must be shaped so as to exclude it." The very first great miracle in christianity, "the birth and manifestation of the Savior," is denied to be a true history, being regarded as incompatible with the laws that regulate the succession of events: however miraculous, therefore, the texture of the gospel narrative, all the wonders recorded must be accounted for in accordance with the assumed principle, that there is no supernatural intervention in the world's history. Hence the theory, that Christ did not make the church, but the church made him: he is represented to have been a pious fanatic, who endeavored to realize in himself the Messianic conceptions that prevailed among the Jews, and thought himself possessed of all the qualities which the superstitious Israelites looked for in their expected deliverer. Thus then, that glorious character portrayed by the evangelists, would be simply the offspring of ignorance and superstition. Everything supernatural connected with his birth, his life and activity, his death and resurrection, and his miracles—all this is ascribed to him merely because prevailing expectations demanded it. What induced the Jews to crucify him, since he so completely answered all their expectations, remains to be discovered: we presume that rationalistic self-complacency does not condescend to answer such impertinent questions. "The chain of endless causation," says Strauss, "can never be broken, and a miracle is an impossibility." Of

course, then, everything miraculous connected with Christ, must be explained according to purely natural principles.

The earlier school of rationalism, which denied even that the evangelists ever intended to assert miracles, or to ascribe aught supernatural to their Master, has now few, if any adherents. It was too materialistic for the ideal tendencies of Germany. Strauss, assailing it in what, with most astounding effrontery, he calls the "*Leben Jesu*," declares, "that it was time to substitute a new method of considering the history of Jesus, for that wornout idea of a supernatural intervention and a naturalist explanation." He, however, attempts this, only to give us naturalism in a different shape. He was too shrewd not to perceive, that to deny that the gospels are miraculous narratives, was pure nonsense. While this he therefore admits, without giving up his fundamental position, that "miracles are not and never were," he resolves all these miraculous accounts into allegories, legends or myths, which, gradually developing themselves among fanciful, credulous and superstitious disciples were at last conglomerated in that wonderful personage set before us in the gospels. He, therefore, with his cool rationalism, must come forward to strip that personage of the supernatural garniture thrown around him by the church, and to bring down everything connected with him into the ordinary every-day observation and experience of Hans and Gretel. For specimens of these rationalistic explanations, we must refer our readers, who do not wish to read the *Leben Jesu* itself, to the volume before us, to Trench on the miracles, and other recent works. They are truly miraculous efforts of genius. We will just give one example. As this rationalistic school cannot deny, that immediately after the death of Jesus, an extraordinary revolution took place in the minds of his disciples: an extraordinary transition from overwhelming grief and deep despair, to gladness and the most hopeful and energetic activity; and as the resurrection, being a great miracle, is, of course, according to these philosophers, impossible, some good common sense explanation had to be contrived. And now, gentle reader, can you guess what wrought this change in the minds of the disciples? Why visions: nothing but visions, produced by their excited feelings. You will perhaps think that, in the deep sorrow and despair that overshadowed their minds, and while dark images of terror haunted their imaginations, their visions were likely to be of a more sombre character, frightful and distressing. This, being more in accordance with the ordinary experience of men, would, however, be too rational a rationalism for these irrational rationalists: they must make up

as improbable a story as possible for their christian mythology, that our love of the marvellous may not entirely starve. As it was quite obvious, however, that this rationalism, with its naturalist explanations, could not fail to sweep the history of mankind clean of its greatest and most momentous events, and thus to convert the past into a barren heath, it is not to be wondered at that the German mind finally recoiled, and refused any longer to believe, under the guidance of such criticism, that history is nothing but a mass of mythological fables. We quote here Mr. Pearson's general observations on this theory.

"Pantheism and naturalism may be said to meet in this theory, which we denounce as one of the most unphilosophical that was ever attempted to be imposed upon the world. Its dogged adherence, in spite of all evidence, to the position that miracles are impossible, is consistent only with absolute atheism or pantheism. Men who adopt, as a fundamental principle, the impossibility of supernatural intervention, must either deny that God is, or deprive Him of His personality. Strauss, as we have already noticed, is a pantheist in the extreme. He stands at that point where atheism and pantheism face each other, and shake hands. And just as one impiety naturally follows another, does his theory of christianity arise out of his other infidel views. But admit the existence of a first intelligent cause, the creator of heaven and earth, the living God—a necessary truth granted by all sound reasoners—and where is the rationality in denying that he either does or can interpose in the system of things which he has established? Reasoning *à priori*, and in accordance with pure theism, we would have been led to conclude that He who made the worlds would continue to govern them, and that, for great and special ends, he would interpose in a special and extraordinary manner.—Whether he has done so or not, must be decided on the broad ground of evidence. The axiom of Strauss contravenes the very foundation principles of the inductive philosophy. A miracle is neither impossible nor incredible, on the supposition of a God."—p. 139, sq.

Many writers, among them the most orthodox divines, have labored accurately to define what miracles are : some maintaining that they lie beyond or above the sphere of natural laws ; others that they involve the idea of suspension, or opposition to these laws. It matters little which of the two definitions we adopt, so long as we admit that miracles are supernatural facts, requiring the interposition or intervention of the God of nature, of Him who created and who sustains all things. If the doctrine of Strauss and his school were true, that "nature

is but a development of God?" "that the chain of endless causation cannot be broken;" and that miracles can only be "violations or suspensions of natural laws," it *might* follow that miracles are impossible. But what do these men know of what lies beyond the contracted sphere of human observation and experience? How do they know that miracles are not perfectly natural in a high order of things, in a sphere of operation not subject to human ken, whilst they are supernatural as respects the economy that lies open to our observation? "At the establishment of christianity," says D'Aubigne, "the superior world acted upon the inferior world, conformably to the laws which are peculiar to it; a miracle is nothing more than this." "Be the miracle contrary to, or lying beyond the subordinate laws of physical nature, it is doubtless in conformity with the moral and supreme law of the universe." "God therefore," says Gioberti, "far from disturbing universal harmony, maintains it, by interrupting the course of the physical forces in certain determinate cases, and for a most wise end."

Mr. Pearson subjects Hume's argument against the credibility of miracles, to a thorough sifting; but we can give it no room here: its fallacy not only, but its contemptible pettifoggery has been so often exposed, that it needs no ventilation here. His fundamental blunder consists in his putting his own narrow, uniform experience into the place of the universal experience of mankind; and all that his reasoning proves is just this, that if he believed anything at all that lay out of the sphere of *his* experience, as doubtless he did a great many, he never for a moment believed his own doctrine. All the questions connected with this subject finally resolve themselves into this one grand question: Is pantheism, or what, as we have shown, is the same thing, atheism, true, or is there a God, and is that God a personal being, infinite in knowledge, wisdom, power and goodness, the maker, preserver and ruler of all things? If the evidence attesting the truth of the gospel narratives is not sufficient to command belief, then all history is of no account, and we must end with believing nothing but what happens to ourselves or within our own observation. But where the evidence is as overwhelming as is that in favor of the truth of the gospel narratives, none but an atheist, and the pantheist is an atheist in masquerade costume, can deny the miracles which they relate. Deny the existence of a personal God, uncaused and the cause of all, and it matters nothing what you believe, or what you deny: admit the existence of a personal God, infinite in every glorious attribute, and you cannot deny that he may interpose in the concerns of the uni-

verse, without setting at nought the laws of your own mental constitution, and utterly stultifying yourself. The negations of Hume and of Strauss are perfectly arbitrary: they beg the question to be proved: they fly in the face of all cautious induction, of all sound philosophy whose aim is *truth*; and their absurdity is the more palpable, in that they utterly ignore the great moral system of the universe, vastly higher than the physical laws with which they deal, in the great principles and the momentous questions which it involves.

The very existence of the Bible itself is a stupendous miracle; and those who deny the supernatural guidance and influences under which it was produced, are, as we have on former occasions insisted, utterly incapable of giving any rational account of its origin. Their denial of the infallibility of the Scriptures, based upon direct divine inspiration whereby universal accuracy is secured, is either just as absurd, or as atheistic, as all their other positions. If there is no God (and all the theories heretofore considered virtually deny his existence), then it is idle any longer to speak of divine inspiration; but if God is, and if he is such as the wisest and best of men have believed and do believe him to be; if his creation is subject to his supreme control, and if he can interfere with what we term the physical laws of the universe, then he can also place himself en rapport, in communication with the minds which he has created, influence and guide them without violence to the nature which he has given them, but in perfect harmony with their constitution. Thus then here also the question simply is: God or no God? And thus also, according to their principles, the existence of christianity itself would be an impossibility, as it would either be causeless, or owe its origin to a vast break in the necessary chain of causation: a system of religion infinitely exalted, and pure, and spiritual, contrived by a number of ignorant fanatics and self-deluding enthusiasts; a motley piece, according to them, of most symmetrical patch-work, consisting of multitudinous scraps flung together into a harmonious whole by a great multitude of minds of every variety of complexions and tendencies, and laboring under monomania, superstition and extravagant visions: a system of morals perfectly consistent throughout, perfectly adapted to the wants of individual and social man, unimprovable in its principles, all-comprehensive in its benevolence, productive of nothing but good in its practical observance, constituting the only stable and safe substratum of individual, social and national integrity and happiness, and yet got up by infatuated self-deceivers under some wild hallucination, or concocted, without a solitary

motive, by a band of designing knaves, who gained nothing whatever in this world, by their contrivance, but reproach, contempt, persecution, suffering and martyrdom. Yet, there it stands, the most stupendous and the most influential fact in human history: there it stands, firm as the everlasting hills, while storm after storm of false philosophy and truculent infidelity spends its fury upon it, and then, having exhausted its rage in fruitless assaults, passes away, leaving that same old glorious and impregnable fact standing unmoved and unshaken, lifting its serene front into the clear and calm expanse of a bright and cloudless sky. Surely in itself a miracle of stupendous magnitude; a fact and consummation, utterly unparalleled in the regular experience of mankind, a fact which, according to the christian view of its history, and of the motives that governed the human agents employed in effecting it, could never have been accomplished without special divine interposition.

The connexion between that naturalism which has given rise to the mechanical theory of the universe, and that rationalism which, bent upon explaining every thing upon natural principles, and rejecting all supernatural interposition in human affairs, has in moral philosophy led men to attach an exclusive importance to external circumstances as influencing human conduct, and has, in theology, banished the supernatural from the sphere of christianity, so as to account for its origin and influence on ordinary principles: this connexion is so obvious, that we need not apologize for considering these several points under one general category. We shall now, in conclusion, take a cursory view of Mr. Pearson's summary remarks upon the theory as a whole.

His first point is, that "*The idea of an entirely self-sustaining universe is based upon a false analogy.*" He very properly insists, that "the very regularity which is adduced to favor the mechanical theory, is adduced more justly in proof of the divine presiding agency. And it is surely more exalting to God to view the universe as directly dependent on his arm, and ever pervaded by his presence, than to compliment him out of it, by attributing to it a self-sustained action. "The falseness of the analogy, however," Mr. Pearson goes on to say, "is obvious. The movements in a piece of mechanism do not, properly speaking, originate with the mechanist. He only employs pre-existing forces, such as gravity, elasticity, cohesion and repulsion. Now, these powers are the very things to be accounted for in the theory which likens the universe to

a machine. In a piece of human mechanism, we can account for these properties, irrespective altogether of the workman. They were there before he existed, and they continue after he is gone. But that the universe, after having been constructed and set in motion by the Almighty, has continued to revolve and develop itself ever since, without his providential agency, is a theory that is unsupported by any analogy whatever. And in the absence of all true analogy, it is more rational to view the creation as always directly dependent on the creator, than to view it as self-sustained. In fact, it is as easy to conceive a self-originated world as of a self-subsisting world. The thing is an impossibility. Dr. Harris says, 'the reasoning which compliments God out of the material universe, not unfrequently ends in excluding him from the throne of his moral government.' May it not be said that the one is done for the sake of the other?" This is sound argument forcibly stated. But it strikes us, that the alleged analogy so complacently urged by naturalist philosophers, is good for nothing when considered from another point of view, which seems to have escaped Mr. Pearson's notice. The analogy is false not only in this, that the mechanist avails himself, in the production of a watch or other machine, of preëxisting forces which *he* could not produce if they did not exist; but in this also, that, after he has availed himself of these and placed them in certain relations to produce his machines, he does not at all abandon his machine, e. g. a watch, in the manner in which the universe is said to be abandoned to itself: no such thing: in fact, he does not abandon it to itself at all: if the object of its production is to be attained, it must pass from his hands into the care and under the management of other hands: after he has produced it, his direct agency, or that of another, his representative, possessing intelligence like, if not equal to, his own, is and continues to be necessary to keep it going, or to restore the regularity of its movements when it is out of order. The clock or watch requires winding up, regulating, repairing &c: the steam engine, the application of the moving force, with constant and intelligent superintendence and management. Thus the author of the machine must either himself continue directly to influence and control his machine, or another, intelligent, if not in equal degree, yet in like manner, as himself, must do it, or it will stop. Either, then, there is here no analogy at all, or, so far as there is any, its evidence is just the reverse of what it is claimed to be, bearing entirely and decidedly against the naturalistic theory. The only analogy that could in any way favor that theory, would be that furnished by a

perpetual motion. But even this would be good for nothing: because, supposing even it might be produced in principle, it would doubtless be constantly getting out of order, and require the interposition of skill to repair, but chiefly because friction would wear it out, and thus stop it in the end; whereas the machinery of God's universe does not wear out, because he is constantly present to keep it in order and to control its movements. Thus then the analogy so much vaunted and relied upon, is a figment, and goes for nothing.

Mr. Pearson's next point is, that "this theory, as it is often advocated, is *chargeable with anthropomorphism*;" and in discussing it he shows, by most satisfactory arguments and examples, that naturalism, "while professing to exalt God, virtually degrades him, "by forgetting or denying his efficient omnipresence, and regarding him as limited in his attributes and operations, in the manner of men. The well known astronomical objection, which had no better foundation than the grossest anthropomorphic notions of God, and which Dr. Chalmers so effectually demolished in his "Astronomical Discourses," here also receives its share of attention. By this theory, then, "the Divine Being is assimilated to the human. He is stripped of the attributes of omnipresence and omniscience, which enter into the glories of his incomprehensible character. This is a damning evidence against this theory of naturalism. It makes God like to corruptible man. Whereas, on the supernatural theory, while his name is excellent in all the earth, his glory is set above the heavens."

Our author next brings forward the evidence of geology, showing that the almighty has repeatedly interfered with his creation, by new creative acts, and thus at once, by a plain and indisputable matter of fact, branding the naturalistic theory with falsehood. This point, though with due brevity, is yet so well and forcibly stated, that we will quote the entire passage, ere we close this article.

In his fourth argument, Mr. Pearson discusses the proposition, that "*christianity and its effects are phenomena for which naturalism assigns no adequate cause.*" Pointing out the foolhardiness of the "attempt to account for a creation without the intervention of the great creator," he very properly insists that, whereas christianity is a new creation, naturalism ascribes it to a cause (the conceptions of the Hebrew nation respecting the kingdom, character and mission of the Messiah), which did not at the time exist, and which, if it had existed, would have been altogether inadequate to the effect. So far from its being true, that the conceptions of the Jews produced a my-

theological phantasm bearing the name of Jesus Christ, it is a notorious fact, well known to every body possessing the most ordinary degree of information concerning the matter, that his character, and his mission as announced by himself, did not at all correspond with the notions, or harmonize with the expectations of the Jews. The reverse is notoriously true. How then is that character, admitted even by infidels to be perfectly unique, to be accounted for? The cause assigned would, under any circumstances, have been inadequate to the effect ascribed to it: under those circumstances which are a matter of history, the effect is ascribed to a cause which not only did not exist at all, but the very opposite cause of which carried all before it. "There are two stubborn things which the theory of Strauss cannot solve. The first is, why, if Christ answered to the conceptions of the Jews, was he persecuted by them, and the more in proportion as he manifested himself? The second is, why, after his death, according to them, if an impostor and blasphemer, was he received by so many thousands of the people who had formerly rejected him?" (p. 165.) For Mr. Pearson's admirable discussion of these two points, we have not space, and we must let it suffice to have stated them.

Our author's next argument is based upon the proposition, that "naturalism, whether viewed as excluding divine providence from the government of the spheres, or from interposing in the concerns of men, is *diametrically opposed to the religion of the Bible.*" He might have added that, like pantheism, it makes all religion and devotion impossible. But, dwelling upon the mysteries of the religion of the Bible, or of christianity, and insisting upon their inseparable connexion, as expressed by Robert Hall, "a religion without its mysteries, is like a temple without its God," he shows that naturalism, by banishing the creator to a distance from the creation, and resolving everything into the unaided operation of established laws, vastly increases, instead of lessening, the mystery, especially when it is maintained that moral evil, that most insoluble of all mysteries, is counteracted, and that men are rescued from its power, by the mere play of natural influences.

As before promised, we now present entire Mr. Pearson's argument derived from geology. "The theory which excludes the divine agency from the universe, and abandons it to natural laws, is *opposed to the palpable evidence of geology.* This science has established, beyond a doubt, not only that our globe has repeatedly undergone great changes previous to its becoming the habitation of man, but that during these changes, several successive creations of animal and vegetable life have

taken place. The organic remains imbedded in strata, that had been formed ages anterior to the existence of the human race, (these strata being separated from each other by considerable periods of duration) furnish evidence of whole groups having been swept away by some violent agencies, and of entirely new races having been called into being to supply their place. Geology tells us that the temperature of the globe in a remote antiquity was such, that our present races of animals and vegetables could not then have existed, and that the creatures then existing, could not have lived now. This being the case, the inference is obvious, that new creations of animal and vegetable life must have occurred, between whose natures and the changed earth there subsisted a nice adaptation. Now, it is for the production of these new races that we demand the interposition of God. There is no power in the laws of nature to produce them. 'The growth of new systems out of old ones,' says the great Newton, 'without the mediation of divine power, is absurd.' Man, compared with the ages that elapsed before his creation, is but a very recent being on the earth. For the production of a creature so distinct in his intellectual and moral qualities from the whole animal creation, a new exertion of the creative power of God was necessary. Theories of spontaneous generation and of transmutation of the species, have not been wanting. But these theories have never risen any higher than vague fancies. The records of geology furnish no indication of such phenomena. And, as Cuvier asks, why, if such transmutations have occurred, do not the bowels of the earth preserve the records of such a curious genealogy? In the domain of fossil geology, we discover abundant remains of distinct species, but not a single specimen of any species being in a state of transmutation has been met with. The faith of the most distinguished geologists and anatomists is very unanimous on this point. The first proposition which Cuvier establishes is, that the species now living are not mere varieties of the species which are lost. 'For myself,' says Agassiz, 'I have the conviction that species have been created successively, at distinct intervals, and that the changes which they have undergone during a geological epoch are very secondary, relating only to their fecundity, and to migrations dependent on epochal influences.' Lyell gives it as the result of a careful inquiry, 'that species have a real existence in nature, and that each was endowed at the time of its creation with the attributes and organs by which it is now distinguished.' 'Everything,' says Sir Charles Bell, in his 'Bridgewater Treatise,' 'declares the species to have its origin

in a distinct creation, not in a gradual variation from some original type; and any other hypothesis than that of a new creation of animals suited to the successive changes in the inorganic matter of the globe—the condition of the water, atmosphere, and temperature—brings with it only an accumulation of difficulties. On the strength of all this high testimony, we may say with Dr. Chalmers, that it places our argument for the interposul of God on firm vantage ground, to assert, that were all the arrangements of our existing natural history destroyed, all the known forces of our existing natural philosophy could not replace them. The records of geology are thus shown to be the records of a special providence. And as Conybeare justly remarks, the geological evidence strikes at once at the root of every sceptical argument against miracles. If God has specially interposed in the ages preceding the present state of the globe, is there not a strong presumption that he has done so at the most wondrous epoch of our earth's history—the introduction of christianity; and that, at some future period, he will again interpose for the accomplishment of his high purposes. Geology convicts naturalism of falsehood, while it warrants us to credit the miracles and revelations of the Bible, if authenticated on the broad ground of evidence. The Almighty had not withdrawn from the world in the remote past, but presided over it as sovereign Lord, and, on befitting occasions, made bare his arm in new exertions of creative energy. And why should it be questioned that he is there still, touching all the springs of life and motion, and upholding all things by the word of his power?"—p. 160, sq.

Although, from the desire to avoid taking up too much space, sundry points of deep interest and great importance have received little more than a passing notice, we trust that a tolerably full and satisfactory view of our subject has been presented. And we may now fitly bring our discussion to a close with Mr. Pearson's concluding paragraph.

"In fine, naturalism viewed in all its bearings, is most unnatural. It has a universe independent of him who created it. It has a Christ, a gospel, and a church, for the existence of which no higher cause is assigned than Jewish conceptions and traditions. It has a world in which moral evil abounds, and depraved human hearts exist, for overcoming and regenerating which, it ignores all but natural influences. In attempting to get rid of mysteries the most sublime and ennobling, it falls into mysteries far more perplexing but less elevating. Were the two systems to be tested by the attribute of mysteriousness, we would prefer supernaturalism, with its mysteries, to rationalism with its mysteries."

ARTICLE VI.

REMINISCENCES OF LUTHERAN CLERGYMEN.

JOHN NICOLAS KURTZ.

A peculiar interest is associated with the name of the subject of this memoir, from the fact, that he was the first Lutheran minister, ordained in this country to preach the gospel. He was born in Lutzelinden, in the Principality of Nassau-Weilburg, and immigrated to this country in 1745. He came to the United States as a *Catechet*, and for two years after his arrival, engaged in the business of teaching as well as preaching, "in consequence of the entire absence," to use his own language, "of competent teachers and the lamentable ignorance of the youth of his parish."

Mr. Kurtz received his preparatory education under the direction of his father, who was principal of a literary institution in his native place. When in his fifteenth year, he was transferred to the high school at Giessen, an institution, in which young men, with the ministry in view, were thoroughly prepared for the work. Having pursued his studies at this place for seven years, with great industry and success, he entered the university of Halle, at a most interesting period in its history, when the immortal Francke was in the meridian of his influence. The instructions, counsels and personal intercourse of this good man, he for several years enjoyed. The varied qualifications of young Kurtz for the missionary work, in connexion with a vigorous constitution, soon commended him to his Professors as a suitable candidate for a mission to this Western world. Accordingly, having completed his course of preparation, and given evidence of an increasing desire to engage in this field of labor, he received the appointment, and in company with several other missionaries, bade adieu to his native land,

"Forsaking country, kindred, friends and ease,"

for these then inhospitable shores, that he might proclaim the boundless riches of Jesus Christ to his perishing countrymen in their vernacular tongue. The following extract from his diary will furnish the reader with some idea of the state of his mind at this period, and the views he entertained of the object, to which he had devoted himself:

"In the year 1744 it pleased my beloved Savior to send me a call by his faithful servant, Dr. Franke, to travel to America. Having obtained the approbation of my dear parents, brothers and sisters, and many christian friends, I have accepted the call, and in company with my esteemed brother in Christ, Reverend John H. Schaum, have prosecuted my journey to this city (Hamburg). Here we have been joined by brother Brunholtz, with whom we are to embark for London, and thence for America. May the Lord Jesus Christ, who was oppressed with affliction, in order that he might be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, powerfully defend and comfort us, and be our guide and safe-guard in all our ways! May He, who could command the services of more than twelve legions of angels, commission his holy angels to encamp round about us for protection, that we may safely reach the place of our destination, and become faithful and successful instruments in collecting his wandering sheep, to the honor of his name, and finally exalt us with them to his own everlasting habitations! Amen."

Such were the feelings of the young missionary on the occasion of his departure from the land of his birth, the endearments of home and the scenes of his youth! How strong his confidence in God! What humble trust and filial faith! Such was the active, earnest and living piety, which influenced him through life, and marked his character during the fifty years of his ministerial career.

On his way to this country, Mr. Kurtz was detained for some weeks at Hamburg. Here he formed some valuable acquaintances, among the number Rev. Messrs. Heck, Fiege and the venerable Ziegenhagen, at the time Chaplain to the King of Great Britain; for all of whom he ever afterwards cherished a very high regard, and maintained with them, until death, an uninterrupted correspondence.

After a long and irksome voyage, he reached Philadelphia on the 15th of January, 1745, where he was most kindly received and cordially welcomed by Dr. H. M. Muhlenberg, who was pastor of the German Lutheran church in that city. Soon after his arrival, he was invited to New Hanover, where he labored for two years, dispensing the word on the Sabbath, and during the week giving instruction to the young. From this point he removed to Tulpehocken, where he remained only a year, requisition having been made for his services by the people of Germantown, Pa., and neighboring congregations, that were famishing for the want of spiritual food.

In the year 1748, the first Lutheran Synod was held in this country, at which meeting Mr. Kurtz was fully set apart to the gospel ministry. At this time there were only eleven regular Lutheran ministers in the United States. There were in attendance at this convention, six clergymen, Messrs. Muhlenberg, Handschuh, Brunholtz, Hartwig, Sandin and Næsmann, the last two of whom were Swedish Lutherans. They, however, participated in the deliberations of the Synod, and assisted in the examination and ordination of candidate Kurtz. Among the questions proposed to the applicant, we find the following, which will serve to show how carefully this ancient Synod guarded against the introduction of improper individuals into the sacred office: *What are the evidences of conversion? What is meant by the influence and blessings of the Holy Spirit? How do you prove that Christ was not only a teacher, but that he made an atonement for the sins of man? Were the apostles infallible in their instructions? How do you establish the claims of pedo-baptism? How do you prove the eternity of future punishment?* Other questions were also propounded, evidently having a reference to the doctrinal errors which then prevailed, and were beginning to be started in the church. The ordination sermon for the occasion was preached by pastor Hartwig, from the words, *His blood will I require at thy hand.* This Synod was established at the suggestion of the Theological Faculty at Halle, for mutual consultation and coöperation among the brethren, and for the purpose of devising means for furnishing the numerous Germans scattered through the land with the preached gospel. The supply of ministers from Europe was altogether insufficient for the demand. In the organization of the Synod, our fathers adopted a very liberal form of church government, similar in many respects to the congregational system of this country. The prominent features embraced in the constitution, were the parity of ministers, the coöperation of the laity in the government of the church, and the voluntary convention of Synod. At the first Synodical meeting laymen were present, and took part in the transaction of business.¹ The elders and deacons of the church, in which Mr. Kurtz had labored as a licentiate, were also called upon to sign his call.²

The subject of our sketch, the same year in which he was ordained, returned to Tulpehocken, in obedience to the re-

¹ Hallische Nachrichten, p. 284.

² Hallische Nachrichten, p. 286.

peatedly expressed wishes of the congregations, to whom he had previously ministered. He remained among them for twenty-two years, doing the work of his Master, and gathering in many trophies of redeeming grace. His duties were numerous and arduous, but they were discharged with conscientious fidelity and unwearied application, and amidst perils and difficulties, exposures and deprivations scarcely credible. At the present day we cannot easily conceive how great was the labor connected with the planting of the church in this Western land. Many were the dangers which beset the early missionaries on all sides, and powerful were the obstacles, which impeded the progress of religion. Ministerial support was inadequate, the places of worship were few, the people were scattered, there was difficulty in travelling, for the want of roads, and frequently the most violent opposition in the discharge of duty had to be encountered. God, in his goodness, raised up for the times the very men that were needed. During Mr. Kurtz's residence in the charge, the services of the Sanctuary were often conducted even at the imminent risk of life itself, as the ruthless Indian lay in wait for victims, and whole families were sometimes massacred. In travelling to his preaching stations, and visiting his members, this devoted servant of God was repeatedly exposed to danger from the attack of the tomahawk and the scalping knife. During the hours of public worship, the officers of the church stood at the church doors, armed with defensive weapons, to prevent a surprise, and, if necessary, to protect ministers and people from the assaults of the Aborigines. In a letter to Dr. Muhlenberg, in 1757, he says, "that on one day not less than seven members of the congregation were brought to the church for burial, having been murdered by the Indians the evening before. Being anxious to improve the solemn occasion to the spiritual welfare of his hearers, he postponed the interment until the succeeding day, and suffered the mangled bodies to remain in the church, that the congregation might convene. This incident also furnishes an illustration of his deep solicitude for the flock, over which he had been placed, and his ardent desire to labor for their conversion to God.

In the year 1771 Mr. Kurtz, who had, by this time, acquired considerable influence in the church, and had received various marks of confidence and respect, especially in being elected Senior of the Synod, was induced to remove west of the Susquehannah, and to take charge of our Lutheran interests in York, Pa. Here he rendered the church incalculable service. He continued in this region for the space of twenty years,

faithfully discharging the duties of the pastoral office, and scattering the good seed of the word, which, watered by the dews of divine grace, took deep root and brought forth much precious fruit. The influence of his labors is yet felt in that whole section of country, and there are those still living, who gratefully bear testimony to the efficiency of his ministry. In 1792, being more than three-score years and ten, he regarded it as his duty to retire from active service. His health began to fail, and the infirmities of age to increase. He found no exemption from the common law of our nature—

Labuntur anni: nec pietas moram

Rugis et instanti senectæ

Afferet indomitæque morti.

He resigned his charge and removed to Baltimore, Md., taking up his residence with his son, in whose kind family he enjoyed every attention and those grateful marks of tenderness and love, always due to a good father and a faithful servant of Jesus Christ. Here he spent the remainder of his days, waiting for the call of the Lord, and although stricken with years, and worn out with labor, he still occasionally filled the pulpit of his son,¹ until 1794, when he was released from his mortal tabernacle, and translated to his eternal rest. A serene and peaceful death terminated his trials and sufferings in this life, and opened heaven to his emancipated spirit. He departed from this world in the calm sunshine of gospel light. He was buried in Baltimore, and a discourse suitable to the occasion delivered by Rev. J. G. Doldeneir, of the German Reformed church, from the words: *There remaineth, therefore, a rest to the people of God.*

Perhaps no one of the patriarchs of our church labored more extensively and usefully than he, whose career we have attempted briefly to sketch. His life was long, laborious and successful. His literary attainments, his deep spirituality, his fervent zeal, his pulpit ability and pastoral efforts, have secured to him a high eminence among those distinguished men of God, who at an early period of our history abandoned their native land, and the comforts of home, to proclaim the glad tidings of redemption in this distant country. He was an acceptable, impressive and effective preacher. He presented God's message without fear or favor, declaring the whole truth, regardless of praise or of censure—

¹ J. Daniel Kurtz, D. D., who now upwards of ninety years is still spared among us as a relic of a former generation.

"By him the violated law spake out
Its thunders."

The impenitent were brought to realize the depth of their depravity, to experience a conviction of their danger and their guilt, and to feel that out of Christ there was no safety. The contrite in heart were encouraged and directed to the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world; they were taught to exercise faith in the crucified Redeemer, and to believe, that the bruised reed he would not break, and the smoking flax he would not quench:

"By him, in strains as sweet
As angels use, the gospel whispered peace."

During his residence at Germantown and Tulpehocken he, from time to time, visited New York, Philadelphia, Lancaster, Frederick, Hagerstown, and numerous other places, and spent whole months in preaching, catechising, and instructing the youth of the church. So deeply did he sympathize with our people who were destitute of the means of grace, that he spared no effort for their spiritual improvement. His influence upon the young was very great. He possessed, in an extraordinary degree, the faculty of securing their attention and interesting their affections. He could, without any difficulty, adapt his instructions to the capacity of children. His catechetical lectures, whilst he was pastor of the church at York, were delivered on Sabbath afternoon, and usually attracted larger audiences than the morning services. All ages and classes flocked to the church, and listened to his words with an attention and pleasure seldom witnessed. Much of the success, that attended the ministry of this devoted man, we have heard ascribed to the faithful performance of this important department of pastoral labor. He loved the work in which he was engaged, and to which, in his youth, he had consecrated himself. Expansive benevolence was a prominent feature in his character. His was a genial spirit, kind and affectionate to all. It is not the privilege of every one to pass through life, enjoying the esteem of so large a circle of friends and to die so generally and deeply lamented. Music furnished to him his principal recreation. He was born a musician, and his natural talent in this direction, he had cultivated in a high degree. His love for it was most decided and enthusiastic. Its influence upon his character was most favorable. It refined his taste, softened his manners, and increased his facilities for doing good. His fondness for good singing contributed very much to the improvement of this part of divine worship in all his charges.

Mr. Kurtz was a man of strong mind. There was nothing brilliant in his mental composition, yet there was soundness and much practical wisdom. His early advantages had been of a high order. The best opportunities for culture had been afforded him. All the powers of his mind had been successfully disciplined and fully developed. His views on subjects generally, were comprehensive, his information was extensive, his reading well selected and thoroughly digested. An estimate of his literary standing, and of the respect entertained for his attainments, may be inferred from the fact that he was specially invited by the Faculty of the College of New Jersey, to be present at their *annual commencements*, although he was some distance from Princeton.

It may here be incidentally stated, that in our early history in this country, the various denominations of christians manifested for our ministry the greatest regard. Their learning was such as to challenge admiration, and procure the confidence of all, with whom they came in contact. They were everywhere treated with kindness. From all they experienced the most friendly attentions. They lived on the most intimate terms with their cotemporaries. Their intercourse with brethren of all creeds was most pleasant. Dr. Muhlenberg, in one of his letters, speaks of a visit made him by Dr. Tennant, as a season of spiritual refreshment. He also attended by particular invitation, a convention of the Episcopal church, and met with a most cordial reception. In 1763, Rev. Messrs. Durkee, Peters and Ingliss, of the Episcopal church, Drs. Findly and Tennant, of the Presbyterian church, and Rev. Mr. Whitfield attended a Synodical meeting of the Lutheran church, and by a vote of Synod, Whitfield preached a sermon. He was likewise present at the examination of the children of the Philadelphia congregation on the truths of the christian religion, at the conclusion of which he delivered an address. Our clergymen in that day were men of fervent and practical piety. It was their constant aim to do good. They were intensely interested in the salvation of souls. Their preaching was evangelical and instructive. Their journals show that they constantly prayed for the divine presence, and confidently looked for the promised blessing upon their labors. Daily in the temple, and in every house, they ceased not to teach and preach the gospel of Jesus Christ. The narrative of the establishment and progress of the American Lutheran church, contained in the pages of the *Hallische Nachrichten*, and furnished by Drs. Muhlenberg, Brunholtz, Helmuth, Kunze and others, cannot fail to produce a most favorable impression, respecting

these devoted men, their sacrificing labors, and the wonderful results they achieved. Something of their spirit may be gathered from the concluding paragraphs of a document deposited in the corner-stone of Zion's church, Philadelphia, erected in 1776, and addressed to posterity, which, we are sure, will prove interesting to our readers:

"And now, dear children and children's children, we commend you to God and the word of his grace, who is mighty to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all who are sanctified. We confidently trust, that we are not guilty of your blood, if you neglect your salvation in the wilderness of this world. Observe diligently and carefully your church regulations, that in virtue of them, you may always be provided with pastors and teachers, who take heed to themselves and the flock, over which the Holy Ghost shall have set them as overseers, that they may feed the church of God, which he has purchased with his own blood; and act towards these your teachers, so that they may discharge their duties with joy and not with grief, for that is unprofitable to you. Take heed also through the grace of God and the means of his grace, that you may become and abide fruitful branches in Christ, the true vine, children of light, members of his spiritual body, and living stones of the heavenly Zion. Suffer no discord or party spirit to arise among you, but quench its first appearance with christian love and mildness. Act kindly and neighborly towards the members of our sister churches, and do to them as you wish that they should do to you. Hold fast what you have, that no one may take your crown. Let that mind be in you, which was in Christ Jesus, and walk as he did walk. And if in following him you are tempted by trials and sufferings, think it not strange, but rejoice when you suffer with Christ, so that, in the revelation of his glory, you may have everlasting joy. Now to the God of peace that brought you from the dead, our Lord Jesus, the great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect in every good work, to do his will, working in you that which is well pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory for ever and ever."

JACOB GOERING.

It was said, in reference to the subject of the following sketch, at the time of his death, that many generations must pass away, before the world could look upon his equal. From all accounts, he must have been a most extraordinary man, gifted with rare endowments of intellect, and possessed of the

noblest qualities of the heart. In early life his opportunities for the cultivation of his mind were limited, and yet so active were his native powers, and so faithful was he in the improvement of the advantages he subsequently enjoyed, that he soon rose to an eminent position, and his name has been transmitted with high lustre to posterity. He was a man of great mental activity, of profound thought, earnest and independent inquiry, and of extensive erudition. He was regarded by all as an elegant scholar and an eloquent speaker. His perceptions were strong and clear, his habits of investigation vigorous and accurate, and so quick were his acquisitions, that they seemed almost intuitive. His thoughts, too, were uttered in the clearest, most appropriate and forceful language. Such was his clearness of apprehension, correctness of judgment and precision of expression, that he never found any difficulty in conveying the idea he intended, or making the subject plain to the comprehension of his hearer. He was always intelligible and lucid. He made others understand him, because he understood himself—

*Cui lecta potenter erit res
Nec facundia deseret hunc nec lucidus ordo.*

As a student he was indefatigable, and his zeal in the pursuit of knowledge was unquenchable. It was absorbing. Nothing could check his ardor, arrest his progress, slacken his efforts, or divert him from his purpose. He was thorough, inquisitive, patient and persevering. His motto was *Nil desperandum*. Him no discouragements disheartened, no fears appalled, no labors wearied, no opposition crushed. All obstacles were disarmed and powerless, when the aim was worthy, and victory his object.

Although Mr. Goering was so diligent and wrote much, he published very little.¹ He seemed to have an utter aversion to the publication of any of his writings. His manuscripts contained discussions, that exhibited his original genius and energetic mind. They were not confined to the examination of theological questions, but they embraced inquiries into the oriental languages, with translations from the most beautiful of the Arabic poets. Unfortunately for literature and the church, his valuable papers, together with all his letters, during his last illness, in compliance with his directions, were committed to the flames.

¹ He did publish a couple of works on the subject of baptism—*Besiegter Wiedertauffer*, 8 vo. pp. 92, 1783; and *Der Verkappte Priester Aaron*, 1790. Also an answer to a Methodist's remonstrance. Two of these publications were anonymous.

Mr. Goring's power in the pulpit was very great. It was irresistible. He would electrify whole assemblies, transferring to them his passion at his will. No one who ever heard him, could fail to admit his uncommon power over the minds of his hearers. He was animated and fervent, and produced the conviction that he was deeply in earnest. He was always in earnest, and with a feeling heart delivered God's truths. On funeral occasions he was particularly happy. There was in his manner a tenderness and a pathos, which made them long remembered. The matter, presented at these times, usually made an abiding and permanent impression. As a pastor, he was active, zealous, and faithful, most devoted to the people of his charge, and indefatigable in his efforts to bring souls to Christ. The smiles of Heaven rested upon his labors. His congregation rapidly increased, and hopeful converts were added to the church. His preaching was of a most evangelical and practical character. The scriptures he exalted. He was not disposed to reject divine truth, because he could not comprehend it, or to elevate human reason above the Bible. The doctrines embraced in the fall of Adam, and the consequent depravity of the human race, the divinity of Christ, and the reconciliation effected by him between God and man, the influence of the Holy Spirit, our own insufficiency and constant need of the promised aid, were the themes upon which he most frequently discoursed. It was his practice to present from the pulpit systematic doctrinal instruction, always accompanied with a pointed application and an earnest appeal. Catechetical instruction he valued most highly, as our fathers generally did, and he improved every opportunity afforded him to urge its importance upon the attention of his people. Those who sat under his ministry, considered it as a great privilege. They appreciated his services, and felt that it was a distinguished honor to enjoy the benefits of his teachings. It is seldom, that an individual awakens so enthusiastic a regard or secures so strong a hold upon the affections of an entire community. Occasionally we meet with some of his old parishioners, who were introduced by him into the church, and we are struck with their devotion to his memory, their profound veneration for his character, and their grateful appreciation of his services. He possessed the faculty of attaching to him every one, who came within the circle of his influence. There was a charm in his instruction, which none could resist. His kindness of heart and geniality of temper were very striking. He knew so well how to interest the young, and to become their delightful companion. Little children would gather around him and

clamber upon his knees, whilst he cordially received their warm caresses, kindly reciprocated their simple greetings, and fervently invoked upon them Heaven's benedictions. He was habitually cheerful and uniform in his disposition. His conversation was interesting and often quite facetious, characterized by dry humor, and sometimes abounding with sparkling wit. Yet his manners were dignified. He never let himself down by invading the character of others, or was he unmindful of the position he occupied as a minister of the Most High. He was distinguished for his social qualities and domestic virtues, as a warm hearted and charitable christian, beautifully illustrating in his life the sincerity of his faith and the power of the gospel. His claims to discipleship none questioned. His qualifications for the joys of the eternal world all admitted. His successor in the pastoral office remarked on a certain occasion, "that Goering would stand among the stars of the first magnitude in the kingdom of heaven."

But when we seated ourselves for the task assigned us, we proposed to give some chronological facts, that our article might be useful for reference. Rev. Jacob Goering was of German extraction, and born in York County, Pennsylvania, on the 17th of January, 1755. His father was a farmer, and had designed his son for the same occupation, but discovering in him unusual sobriety and reflection, he gave him all the advantage that could be derived from the schools in the neighborhood. The youth was soon distinguished for his assiduity, and displayed great eagerness in the pursuit of knowledge. To study he devoted his days and a great part of his nights. He was accustomed to find his pleasure in books rather than in active sports, and every thing in which he engaged, indicated the bent of his mind. So devoted was he to the acquisition of knowledge, and so constant in his application, that he gathered up all the fragments of time, that not a moment might be lost. Such was his passion for study, that when abroad in the field, during the intermissions of labor, the book was immediately taken from his pocket, and the brief, but by him highly prized, interval diligently improved. He made rapid strides in study. His progress was that of a giant. It exceeded everything that had been known in all that region. His memory was so retentive, that it seemed to forget nothing that it read or heard. At school he was quickly far in advance of all his companions, even those who had started long before him, and whose advantages had been superior. With his years this desire for improvement increased, although the means failed. His father

perceived that there was little prospect of his son becoming a successful farmer, as his inclinations seemed to lie in so different a direction, and his studious habits did not suit that constant attention and industrious labor, which skilful husbandry demands. Being a youth of promising talents and hopeful piety, he was soon designated for the ministry, and with this view now pursues his studies. He also took charge of an English school near his father's home, which enabled him to carry his studies forward, and to extend his researches.

When in his eighteenth year, young Gœring removed to Lancaster, Pa., for the purpose of prosecuting still further, the course of study already commenced, under the instructions of Rev. Dr. Helmuth, at that time pastor of the Lutheran congregation in that place. He became an inmate of his preceptor's family, and with great zest engaged in the work of preparation for the sacred office. A new field was opened for his investigations, which he faithfully and most successfully cultivated. He was distinguished for industry, perseverance and proficiency, and in a short time acquired a familiar acquaintance with the Latin, Greek and Hebrew languages. The excellencies of the young man soon attracted the attention of Dr. Helmuth, who became his devoted friend and faithful counselor. With his pious and learned instructor he remained two years, at the end of which time his theological studies were completed, and his fitness for the work of the ministry acknowledged. He was licensed to preach by the Synod of Pennsylvania, and immediately took charge of the Lutheran church in Carlisle, and the congregations in the vicinity. He married in early life, but was soon called to follow to the grave the companion of his bosom. This was to him, at the time, a severe affliction, but it proved a rich blessing. God's providence was sanctified. He came forth from the trial spiritually improved, a more experimental christian, and prepared to labor with greater zeal for the salvation of souls. From this period he preached the gospel with increased fervency, and appeared more than ever interested in the work to which he had consecrated himself—

"Afflictions from above
Are angels sent
On embassies of love."

Those whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth. All the occurrences of life are intended for the christian's highest good, and will work out for him a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory. Mr. Gœring was subsequently married to a

daughter of Rev. J. N. Kurtz, who, with eight children, survived his death.

In 1786 he received and accepted an invitation tendered him by the Lutheran church in York, Pa. After serving the congregation for five or six years, he was prevailed upon to locate in Hagerstown, Md., for the purpose of building up the waste places in that region, and gathering together our scattered members. During his absence from York, for upwards of a year there was no pastor secured, and such was the love the congregation cherished for him, that they earnestly entreated him to return. They so strongly persisted in their wishes and seemed so unwilling to unite in the choice of another incumbent, that he felt it his duty to resume his connexion with the charge.

He continued to minister to this congregation until his decease. He died at his residence in York, on the 27th of November, 1807, in the fifty-third year of his age, and the thirty-second of his ministry. He had been, for some time, in feeble health. His last illness was slow consumption. But as long as his declining strength allowed, he discharged the duties of his office. When bodily infirmities deprived him of the satisfaction of meeting his people in the sanctuary, he ceased not to exhort those who came to see him, to attend to their highest interests, and to keep eternity constantly in view. After a season of protracted suffering, he was taken home to his heavenly Father, to enter upon the rest promised to the people of God.

Mr. Goering's death was the occasion of heartfelt grief. Not only did the church, in which he was so bright and shining a light, mourn, but the whole community, upon whom he had left a strong impression of his integrity and piety, knew that an irreparable loss had been sustained. No one seemed insensible to what was regarded as a public bereavement.

Quando ullum inveniet parem?

By all his loss was felt—by all his death was deplored. He was the friend and father of all, and all felt that it was their privilege and their duty to mourn—

"Their father, friend, example, guide removed!"

The funeral services were conducted by Rev. George Geistweit, of the German Reformed church, from the words—*We trust we have a good conscience, in all things willing to live honestly*; and Rev. Emanuel Rondthaler, of the United Brethren church, from the text—*Well done thou good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will*

make thee ruler over many things : enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.

We cannot, perhaps, more appropriately close our memoir of Mr. Geering, than by introducing an extract from the sermon preached at his burial by Rev. Mr. Geistweit. The language, employed by a cotemporary and colleague in the ministry, will doubtless be read with interest, and valued as an additional testimonial to departed worth.

After considering the nature and office of conscience, and the comfort which a good conscience affords, the preacher proceeds to examine the life of the deceased, and to show the good conscience he evidenced in the performance of his official duties, and in the general tenor of his life : "As long as he fed the flock entrusted to him by the great Master," says the preacher, "I doubt not he could adopt the words of Jeremiah : *That which came out of my lips was right before Thee. Be not a terror to me. Thou art my hope in the day of trouble.* Whatever he found enjoined in the word of his Lord, that he preached ; not adulterating it, but in simplicity, as in the presence of God, he preached Christ. He had a sincere reverence for God—virtue, faith, love, hope, meekness, humility and patience were eminent traits in his character. He faithfully performed the work of the gospel ministry, exhibiting in the discharge of all his duties, a blameless walk. Constantly and faithfully devoted to his work, he acted in view of his responsibility to the all-searching God, and joyfully declared the whole counsel of God.

To his congregation he showed himself a faithful pastor, watching over it with zealous care. He regarded it as God's own flock, a flock which Jesus had purchased with his own blood. He often looked forward to the account, which he would one day have to give. In all his duties he was animated by love, performing them not by constraint, but willingly, for the promotion of God's glory and the salvation of his fellow men. With him there was no assumption of authority over his people, but in all things he was a correct pattern for them. He preached and persevered, he rebuked, warned and patiently instructed. Your own consciences, brethren, will bear witness to all this. In him the bereaved found consolation and sympathy. The weak and timid approached him and were confident that he would listen to them. The troubled and the tempted resorted to him for counsel, and departed relieved of their heaviness. The hearts of the sick rejoiced in his presence ; they were refreshed and revived by his fervent and affecting prayers. When divine judgments threatened he

stepped in, and with earnest supplication exhorted to repentance. Like Nathan with David, he fearlessly rebuked the sinner, urged him to forsake sin and to accept happiness.

His preaching was not in words only. It sprang from a heartfelt experience of true religion in his own heart. He had been tried by the assaults of temptation; these conflicts taught him to trust in God, and depend upon his word. With the nature of repentance, faith, the new birth, justification and sanctification, he was experimentally acquainted, and could therefore give unto every one his portion of instruction in due season. We require no more of a steward than that he be faithful, and that he employ the talent entrusted to him for the glory of God and the salvation of his fellow men. We know that your pastor was such; that he labored diligently for your salvation and his own; that in all things he walked uprightly, and could well say in the words of the text: *For I trust I have a good conscience; in all things willing to live honestly.* After he had exhausted his powers in the vineyard of the Lord, when his strength failed him, and his sickness increased beyond the hope of recovery, he prepared himself for death, as Aaron on Horeb, and as Moses on Nebo. He was composed in his mind, and having given advice in regard to his household, he comforted those, who were weeping around him, bade them farewell, and commended them to the grace of God. He then committed his congregation to the protection of the Most High, and his soul into the care of his heavenly Father. Thus died a father, an instructor, a comforter and a counsellor. Thus went out a light in the church of our God. We trust that he has already arrived at the gates of eternal bliss, and his soul has already been borne by the angels into Abraham's bosom. Already the welcome has been given; *Well done thou good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.* There he will shine as the brightness of the firmament. He sought to turn many to righteousness; he will shine as the stars forever and ever. Now since his labors are ended, how pleasant will be his rest!"

FREDERICK DAVID SCHAEFFER, D. D.

The character and ministry of this venerable man are worthy of a permanent record in the history of our earlier ministers. His life was emphatically a life of severe and constant labor. He was distinguished for his learning and piety, and after having faithfully served his day and generation, he peace-

fully passed away, leaving to his children and the church, the precious legacy of a good name.

"While the soft memory of his virtues yet
Lingers, like twilight hues, when the bright sun is set."

Dr. Schaeffer was a native German, and immigrated to this country in 1776. He was an orphan, and came in company with an uncle, who appears soon after his arrival to have died. The youth was thus left, at an early age, in a strange land, destitute and friendless, without a protector or a home. But in his loneliness and desolation he was not forsaken! That covenant-keeping God, to whom he had been dedicated in infancy, was exercising over him a watchful care, and preparing him, by a course of discipline, more effectually for the work which had been appointed him. *God's thoughts are not as our thoughts, neither are his ways as our ways.* How constantly can the christian trace the finger of God, and recognize his guardian care and superintending guidance, in all the occurrences of life! He is often led by a path of which he knew not at the time. The dispensations of Providence may sometimes seem mysterious, altogether inexplicable to human reason, yet we do know that if we love God, all things shall work for our good. One of the most comforting doctrines of divine revelation to the believer is, that he is under the administration of an infinitely good, wise and perfect Being. Thus he gains strength for the future, and girds up his loins to the work.

The subject of our narrative, the son of John Jacob Schaeffer, and his wife Susanna Maria, was born in Frankfort on the Main, November 15th, 1760. On the third day after his birth he was given to God in baptism. His parents were both pious, and although in early life he was deprived of them, their sacred influence over him was never lost. The foundations of his character were deeply laid in the dispositions and habits, he at this time acquired; to the pure atmosphere, he then breathed, must be ascribed the strength and the vigor of his moral constitution. The religious principles they inculcated were never effaced from his mind. In after life he retained an indelible impression of the scenes of his childhood, and cherished for the memory of his devout mother, who died when he was only twelve years of age, a most tender affection. He often spoke of the counsels she gave him, and the fervent prayers, with which they were enforced. To their power, in connexion with the divine blessing, he was accustomed to ascribe his subsequent change, the surrender of his heart to God. With how many illustrations are we furnished of the strength

of youthful impressions, of the deep and lasting influence, which early religious instruction exerts, of encouragement to fidelity in the training of the young.

*Quo semel est imbuta recens, servabit odorem
Testa diu.*

The character is most generally formed in youth, and if you secure it in time, you may mould it into any form, making it productive of the highest good in this life, and fitting it for happiness in the skies. At this interesting and critical period, you may imprint upon the child your own soul, you may give it a direction which no later effort may change. There are no inveterate habits to destroy, no strong prejudices to eradicate, no perplexing cares to disturb. There are the fewest obstacles to spiritual progress, the least opposition to embarrass. Unsuspicious and unbiassed, the youthful mind drinks in instruction, and under the influence of the Spirit, is transformed into the image of the Savior, and becomes conformed to his will. Even if our efforts should not be immediately crowned with success, there is no reason for despair. We are commanded in the morning to sow the seed, and in the evening to withhold not our hand, for we know not whether shall prosper either this or that, or whether they both shall be alike good. If we go forth in our Master's strength, relying upon the promised aid, and expecting the blessing, we shall not be disappointed. Although the seed may seem to have died, yet in God's own time it will spring up and bear fruit unto eternal life. *Train up a child in the way in which he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it. Those that he planted in the house of the Lord, shall flourish in the courts of our God.* The promise is to us and to our children. Blessed are the children of pious parents, who are conscientious and faithful to the little ones heaven has committed to their training!

In 1768, young Schaeffer was sent to the Gymnasium in Hanau, to be educated. In this school he remained for six years, till his father's death, which occurred in 1774. He was in his fourteenth year when he left the Gymnasium and found a home in the family of his grand-mother, a wealthy widow. His education was then, for a season, conducted by his uncle, Superintendent General at Rodheim, in the kingdom of Wittenberg, by whom he was, in the year 1774, received into the church by the rite of confirmation. The following year his grand-mother dying, his studies were again interrupted, and his plans for the future changed. The homestead was broken up, the patrimony divided, and the family separated. One of the uncles determined to visit America, and carried with him

the subject of our sketch. This was the origin of his settling in the United States. Losing his guardian soon after his arrival, the first knowledge we have of the young man, is in the capacity of a teacher in York County, Pennsylvania. As his education had been carefully conducted in his youth, he was well qualified for giving instruction, and acquired a reputation for skill in teaching. We have recently conversed with an aged friend, acquainted with some of his operations, who spoke of the favorable impressions which young Schaeffer left upon the community in which he, at this period, labored. Whilst engaged here in the business of teaching, he was brought under the influence of that excellent man, Rev. Jacob Gœring, who became interested in his welfare, sympathized with him in his difficulties, and gave him consolation, encouragement and support. He received him as a student of Divinity, taught him the Hebrew, and superintended his theological studies, according to the usages of the times, and prepared him for the ministry of reconciliation. This important subject had often engaged the attention of the young student before his departure from his native land. His own inclinations had long led him to think of the same office. His choice of this profession accorded with the wishes of his father. He knew too, that his mother had consecrated him in infancy to the work of the ministry. This fact affected him deeply. Its influence was irresistible. His mind was satisfied as to the course he ought to pursue. The path of duty was made plain. The prayers of his mother were answered.

He was licensed to preach the gospel in 1786, by the Synod of Pennsylvania. He received his ordination October 1st, 1788. As a candidate, he took charge of the Lutheran church at Carlisle, and preached also to several other congregations in Cumberland and York Counties. In those days, there was a great want of ministers in the Lutheran church, and our pastors usually had an extensive field to cultivate. A charge enclosed a large number of congregations, and covered considerable ground.

During the autumn of 1786, Mr. Schaeffer was united in marriage to Rosina, a daughter of Lewis Rosenmiller, of York County. She was a woman of humble piety, great discretion, and active sympathy, of strong mind and great energy of character, who was fond of reading, and had devoted much time to the culture of her mind. She was such a gift as God bestows only on the most highly favored. She was her husband's counsellor, comforter and cherished companion, with whom he shared the joys and sorrows of earth for half a cen-

tury, and whose death he scarcely a year survived. It may be said with safety that no man was ever more favored in such a connexion—a union of unclouded harmony and unbroken felicity, encircled with heaven's choicest blessings. Their life was a beautiful exemplification of the strength of conjugal attachment, and of the influence which this relation, when properly entered into and faithfully discharged, exerts for usefulness and happiness. From this marriage there were eight children—two died in infancy—four sons became ministers of the gospel, David F. Schaeffer, D. D., who for so long a period had charge of the Lutheran congregation in Frederick, Md., Solomon Schaeffer, who was pastor of the church in Hagerstown, Md., and whose son is C. W. Schaeffer, D. D., of Germantown, Pa., Christian Schaeffer, D. D., who officiated for some time as pastor of the English Lutheran congregation in New York city, and Charles F. Schaeffer, D. D., of Easton, Pa. The fourth son married a daughter of J. Daniel Kurtz, D. D., Baltimore, Md. Two children survive, Rev. Dr. Schaeffer, of Easton, and his sister, the wife of Rev. Dr. Demme, of Philadelphia. Who can calculate the amount of good this family of children, in the providence of God, may have been permitted to exercise, or adequately estimate the power, which pious and faithful parents may wield, even to the remotest generations? When dead, they may still speak in the character and life of those, who were brought under their teachings, and experienced the influence of their holy example. The blessings of piety continue to descend in the lineage of the righteous.

In 1790 Dr. Schaeffer took charge of the then extensive Germantown district. Here he labored for twenty-two years with great acceptance and with manifest seals to his ministry. In 1812 he removed to Philadelphia, having received a call from St. Michael's and Zion's churches, as colleague pastor of Rev. Dr. Helmuth, and successor to Rev. Dr. Schmidt. In this charge he also continued for twenty-two years, exhibiting the same interest for the spiritual improvement of his flock, the same zeal and devotion, which characterized his former career. He occupied this field of labor, during part of the time, when the unfortunate controversy existed, occasioned by the proposition to introduce English into the services of public worship. The contest was protracted and bitter; the discussions warm and acrimonious; the excitement most intense and fierce. Bad feeling and angry strife for a long time prevailed. It was at this period, that a German, a man of intelligence and influ-

ence, in the course of a speech made at a public meeting, called for the purpose of considering the propriety of supplying with English preaching those families in the church, whose children were growing up with a limited acquaintance with the German, remarked, "that the time had come when it would be necessary to shed blood in support of their rights; that at all hazards, the German language and German interests must be upheld." To us, at the present day, such a state of things seems almost incredible, and yet the fact has reached us from the most reliable source. Well may the christian, when his holy religion is thus degraded, and a reproach brought upon his profession, exclaim—

Quis talia fando

Temperet a lacrimis!

This zealous and angry controversy operated as a hindrance to the truth; these animosities and distinctions were fatal to the progress of piety, and proved almost ruinous to the prospects of our church in Philadelphia. Dr. Schaeffer's heart was nearly broken by the sad condition of things. Although he was himself a German, and never spoke English, except from necessity, yet he had not the inveterate prejudices of many of his German cotemporaries. He thought that the German language ought to be upheld, and the interests of his German brethren protected, but he entertained Dr. Kunze's views respecting the introduction of the English into the exercises of the pulpit, and thought the German congregation ought to make provision for those, who understood only the one language. From all that we can learn, his course was most reasonable. He sympathised with those, whose preferences were for the church of their birth, but whose ignorance of the German debarred them from the enjoyment of the privileges of the sanctuary. He thought the views of both parties should be respected.

Tros Tyriusque nullo discrimine mihi agetur.

He knew the folly of attempting to perpetuate the German to the exclusion of the English, and felt that our church must in time become extinct in this country, if its services were confined to its vernacular tongue. He regarded the prevailing tendencies as most disastrous. He witnessed with deep sorrow and painful emotion the state of affairs. But the current against him was too strong—the opposition was most violent. Salutary measures were with pertinacity rejected, and better counsels repelled. He was naturally of a timid disposition, and saw that his efforts must be futile. If he would have

done more to favor the English interests, he would have lost all his influence, and most probably could not have retained his position. If he could, however, have controlled matters, they would have taken a different turn. The evils, that ensued, would never have occurred. If it could have been in his power to prevent the difficulties, our church in Philadelphia might have been saved, and at the present time a different aspect presented—

*Si Pergama dextra
Defendi possent, etiam hac defendere fuerint.*

In 1834, in consequence of the failure of health, and the increasing infirmities of age, he relinquished the active duties of the ministry, and removed to Frederick, Md., to spend the remainder of his days with his eldest son. But his earthly pilgrimage soon terminated. The summons reached him January 27th, 1836, in the 76th year of his age. His last moments were in unison with those of his whole life. He was sustained to the last by a cheerful reliance on the mercy of God through Jesus Christ. He gave unwavering testimony to the truth and power of the religion he professed, and was gathered to his fathers, like a shock of corn fully ripe for the heavenly garner. He was buried in the Lutheran cemetery at Frederick, Md. On the following Sabbath, a sermon appropriate to the occasion, and commemorative of the virtues of the deceased, was delivered by Rev. Dr. Schmucker, of Gettysburg, from the words: *Blessed are the dead, who die in the Lord from henceforth: yea! saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors: and their works do follow them.* The council of the Lutheran church in Frederick, and the corporation of the German churches in Philadelphia, so long served by Dr. Schaeffer, adopted resolutions of genuine sorrow and expressive of the deep sense of the loss the church had sustained in the death of this good man. As a further mark of respect, both these churches were enshrouded in mourning, and in the place of his decease, the bells of all the protestant churches were tolled in testimony of his worth and the profound regard and warm affection entertained for him by all classes of the community, and all denominations of christians.

Dr. Schaeffer was a man of solid abilities and of studious habits. He was a close student, and carefully read the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint. No day passed without the deliberate perusal of the sacred original. His intellect had been invigorated and enriched by earnest effort and constant diligence. It was single in its aims, and more effective than many a mind of greater brilliancy. From the University of

Pennsylvania, in 1813, he received the honorary degree of D. D. As an author he did little. The only work he prepared for the press was a *Reply to a Defence of the Methodists*.¹ Our earlier ministers, although so abundantly able, in consequence of their numerous and arduous pastoral labors, found no time for authorship. Dr. Schaeffer was particularly interested in Geographical studies, and had accumulated a large collection of maps. After his professional studies, this seems to have been his favorite pursuit. He was also enthusiastic in his love of music, and from this source frequently sought recreation. It was his usual practice, every night before retiring, to play on the piano, and sing a few choice stanzas. He had likewise a poetic talent, which in earlier life he was disposed to cultivate. He composed quite a number of hymns. In later years he does not seem to have exercised this gift.

Although there were no striking incidents in the life of Dr. Schaeffer, it was distinguished by excellencies, which any of Christ's ambassadors might desire to attain. He was a most faithful servant of his Master, and, in the performance of his ministerial labors, persevering and indefatigable. He was wholly given up to the work. With it no other aims or cares were permitted to interfere. Every other object was made subsidiary to his vocation. He was active and zealous, and ever ready to discharge the duties of his office. It was his constant endeavor to win souls to the Savior, and to take care of the flock over which Christ had made him overseer. His visits to the sick and poor were uninterrupted. He walked in the footsteps of the divine Redeemer, who went about doing good. He appeared to live but

"To lure to brighter worlds and lead the way."

As a preacher, Dr. Schaeffer was plain and unostentatious, but instructive and experimental. His views on all subjects of christian faith were evangelical. The teachings of divine revelation he implicitly received. After the sacred scriptures he revered the volume of our symbolical books, a Latin copy of which he always read. These, in his judgment, contained a summary of christian doctrine, the truths of God's word. He never, however, exalted them above the Bible. He was tolerant in his views, liberal in his spirit, and conciliatory in his intercourse. His sermons were eminently practical, designed to reach the heart and affect the conduct. His partialities were all in favor of the Arndt and Spener school. These pre-

¹ Antwort auf eine Vertheidigung der Methodisten, Germantown, 1806.

dilections, which he acquired in his youth, he retained through life. Their influence was plainly perceptible in his preaching. He gave his cordial support to all evangelical labors, and was deeply interested in every cause, which had for its object the promotion of God's glory and the advancement of his kingdom. As an evidence of his spirit, we give the following passage from a letter,¹ written by him at a time when an interest was awakened in our church in this country, upon the subject of missions and beneficiary education :

"It has pleased a kind providence that, for many years past, I should be employed as a minister of the gospel of a crucified Savior, in the evangelical Lutheran church. Ready to employ the remainder of my strength and time, so long as God shall please to continue the same to me, in his holy service, I need not assure you that your missionary institution is an object of deep interest to my heart. And while I am sensible of the honor you have conferred upon me, I have to regret that I cannot be a more active member of your body. I am encouraged, however, to pray for a continual blessing upon the pious efforts of your society, and shall take pleasure in contemplating your progress in a good and great work ; for I see that the good seed sown in the evangelical Lutheran church in the United States of North America, is daily springing up more and more—hindrances which were not under our control are lessening, and many able men are engaged in the field, profiting by the good example of those who have gone before them, or who have trained them up for the sacred employment. The church is in the hands of the Lord, who is God over all. To him, our all-gracious Savior, let us look with humility and faith, seeking his glory, and he will bless us as instruments in his hands."

Dr. Schaeffer was a man of ardent piety. All who came in contact with him, were impressed with the conviction that he was a good man. He was conscientious, serious and devout. He lived near his God, and seemed to enjoy communion with his own heart. He was a man of prayer. He, at all times, maintained his christian integrity and remembered his high calling. His character was free from reproach, it was above suspicion. It was transparent, simple and guileless. He was remarkable for his meekness, candor and forbearance. He possessed a gentle disposition, childlike simplicity and vast benevolence. He was quiet, modest, and unpretending, and seemed

¹ In reply to a communication informing him of his appointment as an honorary vice-president of the Missionary and Education Society of the Lutheran church in the State of New York.

to set too slight a value upon his attainments; he was opposed to everything like display, and refrained from what might have been regarded as a reasonable show of learning. In all that he did, he appeared to be actuated by principle, by a desire to answer the great object of his existence. He was a pattern of every christian virtue. His life was gentle, his end was peace! He went down to the grave calmly and without a fear. When the damp of death collected upon his brow, and the hand of the destroyer was uplifted to strike him down, he could review the past with satisfaction, and see those, whose hearts he had gladdened, and whose lives he had cheered. He approached the dark chambers of death—

"Sustained and soothed
By an unfaltering trust,
Like one who wraps the drapery of his couch
About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams!"

He could look forward with joy and humble hope, to those bright and beautiful mansions prepared for him on high, to that city, which hath foundations, whose maker and builder is God. When his heart fainted and his strength failed, God was the strength of his heart and his portion forever.

We cannot, perhaps, more appropriately conclude our brief sketch of this devoted servant of God, than by presenting an extract from the obituary discourse, delivered by Professor Schmucker. It contains some reference to the domestic character of Dr. Schaeffer, and an interesting allusion to the death of the partner of his life, from whom he was, for only a short time, separated:

"'Tis but a few months since ye saw the grave open, to receive into its cold embrace, the friend and companion in life of him, whose departure has convened us to day. Then he stood among the mourners, he mingled his tears with yours, and felt more keenly than you all the wound inflicted by the fatal dart. You mourned the departure of a venerable matron, whose life beautifully illustrated the milder virtues of the religion she professed: or you mourned over the lifeless clay of an affectionate mother, who had watched over your infant hours with the fond solicitude of maternal tenderness, and had early instilled into your minds the benign truths of our holy religion. You participated deeply in the sufferings of the aged holy man of God, bending under the weight of three score years and ten, and tottering on the brink of the grave. But his sufferings were still keener, for he buried part of himself. He resigned into the hands of him, who gave her, the friend of his youth, the partner of his long and checkered life,

his solace in affliction, his consolation in declining years. Yet with that spirit of resignation which characterized his life, he bowed in holy submission to the hand divine that smote him. He said the Lord gave, the Lord hath taken away, blessed be the name of the Lord! Now he too has been cut down; his lifeless remains have been deposited at her side, and both alumber together in death. Be it so! It is the Lord's doing: and he hath done all things well. They have lived long, a rare example of conjugal affection, of christian fidelity and ministerial usefulness. In sickness and in health, in prosperity and adversity they were of one heart, one mind, one hand; and they have together gone to that Savior, whom they together loved and served. With Israel's king let us exclaim: *They were lovely and pleasant in life, and in death they were not long divided.*"

Our earlier ministers, we have found, as we have passed along, were men not only of devoted piety, but of enlarged intellectual culture. Their piety, because of their attainments, was not less active or less efficient. The servant of God, we believe, will have an influence upon the church and the world wide and enduring, as his zeal is accompanied with learning; or the extent and permanency of ministerial influence is, under God, proportionate to its intellectual power. Education gives dignity and value to ministerial action, and increases an individual's ability to do good. It is a gratifying fact, that among different denominations of christians, there is felt an increasing interest upon this subject. No one now rejoices that in his youth, he did not enjoy the advantages of a classical education. All seem to feel the importance of a thoroughly educated ministry. The conviction is gaining ground, that mere piety uneducated will not do, just as education without piety, will fail of the desired object. It will not answer to introduce into the sacred office the halt, the blind and the maimed, to keep the people always limping:

*Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis
Tempus eget.*

The church needs men of a different stamp, those who are competent to feed the flock of Christ with knowledge and understanding, rightly to divide the word of truth. The age demands an educated ministry. The minister of the gospel should be a ready scribe, instructed unto the kingdom of heaven, and like a good householder, able to bring out of his treasure things new and old. He should challenge respect,

and be prepared to grapple with error, in whatever form it may be presented. If a man thinks he is called to the ministry, let him study and qualify himself thoroughly for the responsible work. The mental discipline, which Paul received at the feet of Gamaliel, and the stores of knowledge he acquired in the schools, did not diminish his power to do good. His wonderful acquisitions, while they fitted him the better to combat with error, and to baffle his subtle and learned adversaries, to detect their sophistries, and expose their absurdities, also rendered his teachings to the ignorant and the simple more effective and successful. Luther, Calvin, Zwingli and Wesley were men of profound erudition, deeply versed in ancient wisdom. Their varied attainments contributed largely to the astonishing results they achieved. The Divine Being could carry forward his plans independently of any human agency, but he has seen fit graciously to employ the instrumentality of man, for the accomplishment of his glorious purposes. The enlightening and renovating influences of the Holy Spirit, we regard as indispensable, but we must not think that when God calls men to this sacred work, he sends them forth, as the fabled Minerva proceeded from the brain of Jove, fully grown, and completely equipped for the service, without the necessity of further preparation. God works not without means. In apostolic times, when illiterate men were chosen, he qualified them himself for the office. They were miraculously furnished with the requisite learning, before they were sent forth to preach. Knowledge is necessary to aid in explaining, illustrating, defending and enforcing the truth. "It requires," says a gifted author, "no small learning to be correct. not a little study to be simple, and great command of language to be plain. It is with rare exceptions your uneducated or half-educated men, that confound their audience with great swelling pollysyllables of vanity, imperfect definitions, which are fruitful of error, and thoughts perhaps good in themselves, but with as little arrangement as chaos. The thoroughly educated preacher alone is simple, lucid and intelligible, because his words are well chosen, his scheme preconceived, and his logic exact. Little do the people know what years of patient study were spent over the yellow pages of classic lore, to make the sermon so plain, that the child bears it home and fancies he could have preached it himself."

Ignorant ministers will have ignorant congregations. *Like priest like people.* The ministry is brought into contempt, the church is crippled in its power, and religion is degraded. Would that, in our christian churches throughout the land, we had

men planted of the proper qualifications, wholly given up to the work, to which they have consecrated themselves! We need educated men, men too, who will go forth in the spirit of their Master, in humble reliance upon his strength, to spread the triumphs of the cross, to build up the desolations of Zion, and cause the waste places to flourish like cedars in the courts of the Lord. How important, how responsible is the sacred office! Careless hands should be laid on no man. The herald of the gospel is commissioned by God to make known to men,

"The eternal counsels: in his Master's name
To treat with them of everlasting things,
Of life, death, bliss and woe."

What a power does the pulpit possess, how stupendous its influence! It furnishes means of doing good, afforded by no other human agency, of overthrowing vice and upholding morality, to an extent which nothing else can boast. The day, the place, the theme, the circumstances, the purposes, the credentials, give the messenger of God advantages for this end, unrivalled and unexampled.

"The pulpit, in the sober sense
Of its legitimate, peculiar powers,
Must stand acknowledged while the world shall stand,
The most important and effectual guard,
Support and ornament of virtue's cause."

ARTICLE VII.

Lehrbuch der heiligen Geschichte. Ein Wegweiser zum Verständniß des göttlichen Heilplanes nach seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung, von Joh. Heinr. Kurtz, der Theologie Doctor, und ordentlichem Professor an der Universität zu Dorpat, ord. Mitglieder der historisch theol. Gesellschaft zu Leipzig.—Ephes. 1: 3-14. Manual of Sacred History. A guide to the understanding of the divine plan of salvation in its historical development.

It is but a few weeks since we hastily announced, just on the eve of publication, that this admirable work of an accomplished and pious divine of our church, was in the process of translation in our country, by one of our American theologians.

It can now, although the interval has been short, and the weather exceedingly relaxing and oppressive, be made known that the translation is ready for the press, and will be in the hands of those who desire it, at as early a period as it can be published, after arrangements are made with a publisher. We hope that it will not be long till the book is circulated in the churches. Having had some agency in bringing about this translation, it may be proper for us to say a word concerning the book itself, and the hands into which it has fallen, and by which it has been transformed into another idiom. Dr. Kurtz, the author, is not unknown in the United States. His histories, both of the Bible and of the christian church, have fallen into the hands of students of German theological literature, and have been very favorably received. It could not be otherwise. They are characterized by profound learning, great piety, thorough orthodoxy without narrowness, and striking originality. Their popularity in Germany is evinced by the fact, that they have passed through successive editions. Although but a few years have elapsed since the volume now translated appeared, it has already reached a sixth edition. It has been most favorably reviewed in the Princeton Repertory, by one of the most gifted divines of our country, whose doctrinal views, although differing from those of Dr. Kurtz, did not prevent a recognition and acknowledgment of the uncommon merits of his performance. The translator, the Rev. Dr. Schaeffer, of Easton, Pa., well known in our churches as a finished scholar, and a learned theologian, well skilled both in German and English, and qualified as but few are for such an undertaking, has, executed his task well, and there is every guaranty that justice has been done the original. To enable the reader unacquainted with the work, to form an idea of it, we present, first, some parts of the preface, translating for ourselves, and then we will add some portions of the contents—concluding with an extract from the discussions.

In the preface to the first edition, the author remarks: This manual offers itself to the friends of the Holy Scriptures as a guide both well disposed and true, through the domain of sacred history. It will be an aid in the comprehension of the wonderful ways of God with man, to the intelligent, that is, to those who feel it to be necessary, not only that the objects of their christian faith and hope should be understood by them in their substance, but in addition, in their internal connection, and in their relation to one another. It proposes in concentrated and greatest possible brevity, to open to the willing reader, who believes that in the scriptures he has eternal life (John

5:39), the divine plan of salvation in its historical progress, from its first appearance to its final completion through all the stages of advance and victory. It purposes, to the extent of the author's ability, to unfold to him the treasures of saving truth, and particularly to excite to more extensive and profound individual investigation. Indeed, it ought not to be concealed, that the hope is entertained of its being the voice of a friendly preacher: "come and see the wonders of your God," to many of those to whom is applicable the consoling words of the Lord: whosoever is not against us, is for us (Luke 9: 50), and there are many such, it is to be hoped, in these times. The contents, in part, are the following:

Introduction to Sacred History.

- §1. Idea of sacred history.
2. God's Being in itself.
3. God's external activity.
4. The creation.
5. The source of sacred history.
6. Relation of sacred history to the sister sciences.
7. Character of the sacred history.
8. Periodology and chronology of the sacred history.

First Part.—Creation and the Fall.

- §9. The creation.
10. Location and design of man.
11. The fall.
12. The consequences of the fall.

Second Part.—Redemption and Salvation.

First Division. The preparation and arrangement of salvation.

- §13. Man's capacity for redemption.
14. The divine scheme of redemption.
15. Successive development of salvation.

First period of the arrangement of Salvation.

To the flood.

- §16. Cain and Abel. The Cainites and Sethites.
17. The flood.

Second period of the arrangement of salvation.

To the call of Abraham.

- §18. The covenant of Noah.
19. Noah's sons.
20. Confusion of tongues and dispersing of the people.

In this way he goes over the entire old Testament, and the period between the last of the Prophets and the appearance of the Messiah. The remaining periods without the specifications, are:

Third Period.—Arrangements of salvation till the birth of Christ.

First portion. The times of the Patriarchs.

2. Moses and the law.
3. Joshua and the conquest of Canaan.
4. The times of the Judges.
5. From Samuel till the building of the temple and the division of the kingdom.
6. From the building of the temple till the cessation of prophecy.
7. From the cessation of Old Testament prophecy till the New Testament accomplishment.

The second leading division embraces the completion, the appropriation, and the final issue of salvation.

First Section.—Manifestation of salvation in the person of the Redeemer.

- §120. The fullness of time.
121. The nature of the redemption to be effected.
122. The person of the Redeemer.
123. The forerunner.
124. The genealogy of Christ.
125. The Virgin Mary.
126. The birth of Christ.
127. The circumcision and presentation of Christ.
128. The wise men of the East and the flight to Egypt.
129. The youth of Christ.
130. The baptism and temptation of Christ.
131. The disciples of Christ.
132. Continuation.
133. The prophetic activity of Christ.
134. Christ's preaching of the law.
135. Christ's preaching of the gospel. Testimony concerning himself.
136. Continuation—work of redemption.
137. Continuation—his kingdom.
138. Christ's miraculous power in general.
139. Christ's miraculous control of nature.
140. Christ's healing of the sick.
141. Raising of the dead.
142. Cure of demoniacs.
143. Extension of Christ's agency.

144. Results of his operations.
145. The transfiguration of Christ.
146. The anointing in Bethany.
147. The entrance of the Messiah into Jerusalem.
148. The plans of the enemies of Jesus.
149. Christ's prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the world.
150. The Passover and the last discourses of Jesus.
151. The agony of Gethsemane and the apprehension.
152. Christ before the Sanhedrim, Peter and Judas.
153. Christ before Pilate.
154. Crucifixion of Christ.
155. The death of Christ.
156. The burial of Christ.
157. The resurrection of Christ. Mary Magdelene.
158. The Emmaus disciples and the twelve.
159. The new call of Peter. Institution of baptism.
160. The ascension of Christ.

Second Division.—Proclamation of salvation by the apostles.

161. The object and import of this period.
162. The Pentecost.
163. The internal condition of the first church at Jerusalem.
164. The first persecutions of the church. Peter and John.
165. Continuation. Stephen.
166. Conversion of the Samaritans. Simon Magus. The Ethiopian Eunuch from the East.
167. Conversion of Paul.
168. Peter's miracle at Lydda and Joppa. The conversion of Cornelius.
169. The congregation at Antioch. The execution of James and the deliverance of Peter.
170. The first missionary journey of Paul with Barnabas.
171. Apostolic Synod at Jerusalem.
172. Second missionary journey of Paul. Philippi.
173. Continuation. Thessalonica, Berea, Athens, letters to the Thessalonians.
174. Continuation. Corinth, return to Antioch.
175. Third missionary journey of the apostle Paul. Ephesus (letters to the Galatians, 1 Tim., 1 Chron. and Titus).
176. Continuation. His labors in Europe and return to Jerusalem. (The second letter to the Corinthians, and that to the Romans.

We omit further contents for want of room.

Some idea may be formed of the contents from this partial exhibition. It may, however, not be uninteresting to furnish a specimen of the manner in which the author handles his subjects. Without any special preference and in our own translation, we give the section in reference to demoniacal possessions. On this subject there has been, and yet is, no little diversity of opinion, not only are rationalists at fault in their views on this subject, but likewise many whose pretensions to general orthodoxy are not to be denied.

Cure of the Demoniacs.

1. A terrific and frequent form of disease in the time of Jesus was demoniacal possession. It was regarded, both by the contemporaries of Christ and by Christ himself, as the result of an evil spirit (demon, therefore the sick called demoniacs) actually taking possession of a human personality, and mastering it, and then abusing it to the production of disorderly and unnatural manifestations. Christ's vocation required him, as he had come to destroy the works of the Devil (1 John 3: 8) to subdue these revolting outbreaks of the power of darkness. Remark. Some explanation may be conducive to the comprehension of these conditions. If the first man had (and in and with him the entire race) conformed to his divine appointment, the life of man would have unfolded in uninterrupted and unchanging harmony and unity of all the physical, sensuous and spiritual powers; the entire being of man would have formed a unity in itself, and supported by God, into which no hostile disturbance from without could have effected an entrance. By sin the equipoise and the harmony of his being were destroyed, and so far, that the Spirit, in the first instance, was removed from its right position, and—as the Spirit is the centre and uniting point of human nature—the disturbance passed over to the bodily animal region, where it appeared as morbidness, and became death. By sin the bond too between body and soul, and between soul and spirit is dissolved, and the organism laid bare to disorganizing influences of every description. If noxious natural agents (epidemics, poisons, &c.) enter the human system, and force it to involuntary, unnatural, and destructive manifestations of life, why should not the personal powers of darkness master it in a similar way? As in the former, so in the latter, there may be observed a certain predisposition and aptitude; whether, and to what extent they may have resulted from personal and specific sins, it is obvious that no one can venture to show. The question, whether this form of disease was peculiar to the age of Christ, or occurred

subsequently and even in the present age, must be answered by medical science, guided by christianity. If the first was the case, it could readily be explained, how the power of darkness, just when it could be broken down by the appearance and redemption of Christ, might attain a special elevation and extent. If science must decide in favor of the latter, the diminished occurrence since the rise of christianity, compared with the earlier frequency, would testify to its salutary influence in this respect too, and give us a pledge of the future entire cessation of all influences and operations of the power of darkness.

2. The most remarkable cures of demoniacs are the following: when Jesus, at a particular time, on the Sabbath, in the synagogue at Capernaum, "taught powerfully, and not as the Scribes," a demoniac rushed forward and cried aloud: "what have we to do with thee, Jesus of Nazareth? You have come to destroy us; I know who thou art: the Holy one of God." Thus must the power of darkness, vanquished by the presence of the holy, testify concerning him; but the Lord declined such testimony, and commanded the unclean spirit to come out of him: "Be silent and come out of him." Then the demon threw him down in their midst, left him, and did him no harm (Mark 1: 21 fg.) A much more remarkable event occurred in the region of the Gadarenes (Gergesenes) in Persea (Mark 5: 1 fg.) As Jesus went ashore from the ship, a demoniac noticed him, who, in the most violent maniac rage, had burst chains and bands, and sojourned, naked and solitary, in the tombs of the place. Here too, the vicinity of the Savior operated, and produced a peculiar terrific contest of the natural and foreign personality in the patient. He hastened to Jesus, and prostrating himself in adoration before him, said aloud: what have I to do with thee, Jesus, son of God, the Most High. I beseech thee, torment me not. This diseased man's sensuous condition required a peculiar and very circumspect management. Thus the Savior's remarkable question is explained: what is thy name? and the permission which he gave the Devils (for they were many) to go into the swine which were feeding on the declivity of the mountain. As soon as the swine felt the presence of the foreign power, the entire herd plunged into the sea. The owners of the herd, instead of deriving a heavenly gain from their earthly loss, entreated Christ to withdraw from their neighborhood. At another time, when the Lord was, with three of his disciples, on the mount of transfiguration, there was brought to the other disciples at the base of the mountain, a demoniac boy, in whom the posses-

sion appeared in the most appalling contortions and convulsions. In vain did they try to relieve the sufferer. When Jesus descended, he reproved the unbelief of the father, and of all present, and commanded the boy to be brought to him. As soon as the spirit saw him, he reproduced the frightful convulsions. To the imperfect faith of the father, "if you can, compassionate and help us," Christ answered, "if you believe, all things are possible to faith." Then there loomed up in the father the strongest conviction of the necessity of faith, and the most intense desire for it, and he said with tears: I believe, dear Lord, help my unbelief, and the Lord bade the spirit depart. To his disciples, who enquired, why they could not exorcise him, he answered, because of your unbelief. This kind is removed only by prayer and fasting.

ARTICLE VIII.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

A Harmony of the Gospels, in the Greek of the Received Text; On the plan of the author's English Harmony: with the most important various Readings, brief Grammatical Explanations, select Biblical References, and Chronological Notes. For the use of Students and others. By James Ströng, A. M. New York: John C. Riker, 129 Fulton Street—1854.

WE are much gratified to announce to our readers the publication of this handsome volume. The plan upon which the harmony is arranged is excellent, well adapted to aid in the connected study of the sacred text, by a parallel and combined arrangement: "the *leading account* of each incident is selected from that one of the Gospels which may happen to give it most fully and explicitly; this is printed in large type. With this is interwoven, in small type, every *additional circumstance* contained in the parallel passages of the other Gospels: these latter are also placed in full, in their order, in parallel columns of *smaller type*." The synoptical and textual indexes which are prefixed, are complete and valuable. "The *various readings* exhibited at the foot of the page, include all the variations from the Received Text, that are adopted in the critical editions of Griesbach, Knapp, Scholz, Lachmann and Tischendorf." The grammatical annotations, carefully avoiding interpretation or commentary, are designed "merely to clear up such difficulties in the rendering of the text, as the student might otherwise overlook or find not definitely met by his other reference-books." These, thrown into a separate series of foot-notes, are very judicious and apposite. The chronological notes at the end are full, drawn from the highest authorities, and very

valuable. In relation to the well-known fact that the vulgar era of Anno Domini is incorrect, they discuss various important questions of chronology, and are very full and satisfactory on a variety of matters of importance and interest belonging under this category. In every point of view this Harmony of the Gospels is, in its entire arrangement, and in the additional matter presented, a publication that cannot fail to obtain the approbation of good judges, and the grateful appreciation of students.

Struggles for Life; or the Autobiography of a Dissenting Minister. Philadelphia: Lindsay and Blakistone—1854.

THIS is by no means an every-day book, but in many respects a remarkable production. It narrates the life of one who, from the lowest depth of poverty, and a childhood of unusual sickness and suffering, and amidst a multitude of adverse circumstances which would to most men have been unsurmountable obstacles, struggled upward to the acquisition of learning and eminent usefulness. The most important, valuable and interesting feature of the memoir consists in the candor, fidelity, and copiousness of detail, with which the author's inner life is unfolded, his varied experiences recorded, and his views upon many subjects connected with literature, theology, ecclesiastical and political affairs, and various vital interests of mankind, presented. The author is evidently a man of strong mind, of very respectable talent, and of an earnest and well balanced character; and although there are sundry points upon which we cannot agree with him, we can most cordially recommend his autobiography as a book which none can read without great profit, and which is likely to set many thinking upon subjects on which they have not thought before.

Lectures on the True, the Beautiful and the Good. By M. V. Cousin. Increased by an Appendix on French Art. Translated with the approbation of M. Cousin, by O. W. Wight, Translator of Cousin's "Course of the History of Modern Philosophy," American Editor of the Philosophy of Sir William Hamilton, Bart., author of "The Romance of Abelard and Heloise," &c. &c. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 346 and 348 Broadway, and 16 Little Britain, London—1854.

THE late hour at which the volume has been received, has prevented our giving it that full and close examination which it deserves, and which would be necessary to enable us to speak decidedly respecting its entire contents. The general impression, however, which such examination as we could give it has left upon our mind, is, that this most recent and probably last work of M. Cousin is every way worthy of his genius and his high character. Into whatever errors the illustrious author fell, in his speculations upon the absolute or unconditioned, we have, in our cursory examination, discovered no trace of them, and no place for them, in the volume before us. The treatises on the True and the Good are instinct with a sound and lofty philosophy, replete with acute and cogent reasoning, clear in the exhibition of unquestionable truth and of solid general principles, and radiant with beautiful, striking

and apposite illustrations. Announcing this as his last work, the author addresses, in a spirit of great earnestness, the most serious advice, cautions and admonitions to the youth of his nation, directing them to the religion of the Gospel as the sole foundation of a true philosophy and a holy life. While in the first treatise, he insists that God is not only the infinite source of truth, but Himself truth, so in the third, in which a thoroughly digested and admirable system of ethics is unfolded, and the ethics of interest sternly denounced and shown to be worthless, God, the Divine Nature, is again set forth as the sole origin and fountain-head and foundation of the good, of all that is right and good, as he is of the true. Nothing at variance with the Gospel, with revealed truth, has in either of these treatises met our eye: the recognition of the claims of our holy religion is most decided and cordial. The treatise upon the Beautiful is exceedingly ingenious, satisfactory in its conclusions, and in itself most beautiful. In the appendix upon French art the genius and works of Poussin receive the high appreciation which is due to them.

Even though a closer inspection *might* discover objectionable things, the general character of the work is admirable, amidst the mass of modern infidel philosophy truly delightful, sound in its principles, and masterly in its reasonings, and no student of philosophy can afford to do without it.

Russia. Translated from the French of the Marquis de Custine.
New York: D. Appleton and Co.—1854.

Among the numerous works upon Russia recently published, this, so far as our observation goes, is, in some respects, the most valuable and interesting, because the author not only had unusual opportunities for general observation, but was, in consequence of his rank and reputation, admitted not only to the society of the court, but even to frequent interviews and free conversation with the emperor and empress and the imperial family. Whatever he saw and heard was always, if possible, written down in letters or his journal, on the same day: in the same manner his conversations with the emperor and other members of the imperial family were recorded. Wherever he went, the favor with which the emperor regarded him, procured him extraordinary facilities for acquiring the most valuable information, all which is fully communicated in his pages, accompanied with his own reflections and opinions upon men, institutions and things. The author is evidently a man of distinguished talent, high mental culture and refinement, and, in the main, guided in his observations and in forming his views and opinions by correct or even religious principles, doubtless somewhat Frenchified in their complexion. He is not always quite consistent; for, notwithstanding his protestations to the contrary, he is somewhat of a courtier; yet, as he conceived a great respect for the emperor Nicholas as a man, he scarcely deserves censure for the rather flattering things which he sometimes said to him. Certainly, while his opinion of Russia, its government, political and social organization, &c., is to the last degree unfavorable, his opinion of Nicholas personally is far more favorable than that expressed by other writers upon Russia. The work gives a most thorough account of Russia, its affairs and the character of its inhabitants, enters into minute detail upon all

matters of importance, and is altogether a production of great merit, value and interest.

Utah and the Mormons. The History, Government, Doctrines, Customs and Prospects of the Latter-Day Saints. From Personal observation during a six months' residence at Great Salt Lake City. By Benjamin G. Ferris, late Secretary of Utah Territory. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers—1854.

MORMONISM is the greatest, the most mischievous, and yet the most disgusting heresy of our age. Its astonishing success, more particularly in England and Wales, and quite of late preëminently in Denmark, in gaining converts, and its strange history and fortunes in this country, have naturally provoked a good deal of curiosity regarding it. This curiosity the work before us is every way calculated to gratify, as the author could not have been in a more favorable position for acquiring the most ample and accurate information respecting this detestable sect and its base founders. The narrative is well told, and unfolds a sad tale of villainy and deception on the one hand, and of astounding gullibility and infatuation on the other, constituting a mournful chapter in the history of human wickedness and folly. The most revolting features of his subject the author has touched with due delicacy, while he fully exposes the abominable and atrocious character of this most colossal imposition. A community organized like that at Great Salt Lake City cannot possibly hold together for a long time, and the author accordingly predicts its speedy dissolution and dispersion. Meanwhile it is well that its history thus far has been written by an honest and most competent witness.

Armenia: a year at Erzerroom, and on the Frontiers of Russia, Turkey and Persia. By the Hon. Robert Curzon, author of "Visits to the Monasteries of the Levant." Map and wood cuts. New York: Harper and Brothers—1854.

THE author of this book has been, for some years, favorably known to the reading public through his very delightful work on the monasteries of the Levant. In the volume before us he gives a lively and interesting account of what he observed and experienced during a year's sojourn in a region concerning which and its inhabitants we have not hitherto possessed much particular or accurate information: thus, while dealing with realities, it yet possesses the charm of novelty. It not only communicates a good deal of valuable information, but recounts a variety of stirring incidents and amusing adventures, thus affording an agreeable melange of instructive, interesting and entertaining reading.

Lives of the Queens of Scotland and English Princesses connected with the regal succession of Great Britain. By Agnes Strickland, author of the "Lives of the Queens of England." Vol. IV. New York: Harper and Brothers—1854.

THIS is the fourth volume of a most valuable work, which we have already more than once very fully noticed. The present volume continues the life of Mary Stuart, and we again recommend this work to those who have

imbibed, from the works of other and prejudiced or ill-informed historians, unfavorable opinions respecting the unfortunate Queen of Scots. Miss Strickland's extensive researches and indefatigable labors for the purpose of obtaining strictly authentic and correct information, have enabled her to put a very different face upon many important events in Mary Stuart's life, and to vindicate her character against the unjust aspersions of ignorant, biased or corrupt witnesses. The distinguished ability evinced by the author in the execution of her task, will secure to her writings a great and permanent value.

A Popular Account of the Ancient Egyptians. Revised and abridged from his larger work, by Sir J. Gardner Wilkinson, D. C. L. F. R. S., &c. In two volumes. Illustrated with five hundred wood cuts. New York: Harper and Brothers—1854.

THE republication, in this country, of Wilkinson's great work on Egypt, abridged, and yet at the same time, enriched with important additions, cannot but be gratifying to the reading public generally, as it is not intended for scholars or antiquaries only, but for all who desire general information respecting the condition and affairs, past and present, of our world. The author's eminent competency to do justice to his subject is well known, and he has thoroughly and admirably performed his task. In a popular and attractive method and style he communicates the most ample, minute and accurate information concerning Egypt, its history, the origin of its people, its social and political institutions, its manners and customs, its religion and sacred mysteries, rites and usages, its arts of peace and war, &c., &c., and the illustrations, taken as they are from Egyptian works of art, are of great importance to a correct understanding of the text. Egypt has, for a number of years, past, greatly engaged the attention and largely employed the laborious research of distinguished scholars, and works of profound erudition and antiquarian lore have been the result. Our authors design has been, to present what is known of ancient Egypt in a popular form, without entering into disquisitions interesting only to cognoscenti, or those whose lives are devoted to such studies, and his work is one of the highest merit and value.

Descriptive and Statistical Gazetteer of the World. Edited by J. Calvin Smith. Numbers I. II. III. To be completed in ten Numbers, each fifty cents. New York: Harper and Brothers.—1854.

THIS work, of which three numbers are out, supplies a desideratum long felt, being a Gazetteer, descriptive and statistical, brought up to the actual state of the world, especially of the United States, where progress and growth are so constant and rapid. It is intended to furnish the very latest results of geographical and statistical investigation, and will be illustrated by a variety of maps, engraved for the publication. It will embody the returns of the social, agricultural and industrial statistics of the people, collected in the late censuses of the United States and of British North America, in addition to the full and important contributions to geographical science which have been made by the census returns of Mexico, the Central American States,

South America, Great Britain, and the countries of Continental Europe, as well as by numerous recent and elaborate works upon statistics and geography, and various special branches of science." It is needless to comment upon the importance and value of a work like this.

The Orator's Touchstone ; or, Eloquence simplified. Embracing a comprehensive system of Instruction for the Improvement of the voice, and for advancement in the general art of public speaking. By Hugh McQueen. New York : Harper and Brothers—1854.

WE consider this the best work that we have seen upon the management and improvement of the voice for the purposes of public speaking. It is a subject to which preachers generally pay too little attention, and one ill or imperfectly understood by most public speakers ; and yet if eloquence is the art and power of persuasion, it is obviously one of the very highest importance. The work before us discusses the subject thoroughly : starting from general fundamental principles, it gives rules and directions, furnishes illustrations, and, altogether, presents and elucidates a system of instruction which it appears to us, will, if well studied and carefully put in practice, render most effectual aid to all whose interest and duty it is, to cultivate the noble art of public speaking. To all such we most cordially recommend this work.

Footprints of Famous Men. Designed as incitements to Intellectual Industry. By John G. Edgar, author of "The Boyhood of Great Men." with illustrations. New York : Harper and Brothers—1854.

THIS neat volume contains biographical memoirs of nineteen great men, eminent in various walks of life, seven as men of action, four as men of letters, three as artists, and five as men of science. Among them are Washington, Burke, Lord Erskine, Dean Milner, Southey, Sir Joshua Reynolds, Sir Francis Chantrey, Dr. Hunter, Watt, and Adam Smith. These memoirs are not only written in a very pleasing style, but they present a large amount of interesting matter condensed into a narrow space. Thus the book, though intended mainly for the instruction and encouragement of youth, will be valued by readers of all classes. We were, however, surprised and disappointed to find but one American in the whole group : we cannot but think that our country would have afforded some one more worthy of a place in the volume, than David Hume. But the lives which it contains are well told and exceedingly interesting.

Twenty years in the Philippines. Translated from the French of Paul P. De La Gironiere, Chevalier of the Order of the Legion of Honor. Revised and extended by the author, expressly for this Edition. New York : Harper and Brothers—1854.

THIS is a most extraordinary Book, serving most strikingly to illustrate the common saying, that "truth is stranger than fiction." It gives a lively and exceedingly interesting account of the author's twenty years' sojourn and enterprising career in the Philippine Islands, of the remarkable scenes, the

singular vicissitudes, and the strange adventures through which he passed in that comparatively little known part of the world. As the events, incidents, and adventures here narrated are certainly of a most extraordinary character, it is well that the author's veracity and honorable character are amply vouched for by M. Gabriel Lafond, H. Hamilton Lindsay, Esq., of Westdean House, Chichester, M. Dumont D'Urville, and Admiral Laplace, who, knowing the author personally, and being cognizant of the facts which he relates, are competent witnesses to the truth of this most singular narrative.

Sandwich Island Notes. By a Häolé. New York: Harper and Brothers—1854.

WHAT Häolé means, we know not: probably it is Hawaiian for traveller, this being the work of an American voyageur, who describes the Hawaiian Islands, the scenery, the people and their customs, and gives his impressions of the state of affairs in that important group, and of their prospects for the future. Unlike other travellers in that region, he speaks respectfully of the missionaries, and favorably of the result of their labors. His descriptions, his narratives of incidents and adventures, are graphic and spirited: his observations candid and sensible: his strictures upon various abuses and criminal practices, severe: and he is earnest in his advocacy of the annexation of the islands to the United States, as alike important to both parties. In connexion with this question of annexation, this is a seasonable publication, well adapted to gratify the interest that has been awakened in the community with regard to these beautiful islands.

Farm Implements, and the Principles of their construction and use; an elementary and familiar treatise on Mechanics, and on Natural Philosophy generally, as applied to the ordinary Practices of Agriculture. With two hundred engraved illustrations. By John J. Thomas. New York: Harper and Brothers—1854.

A most admirable work, that ought to be in the hands of every intelligent farmer.

The Catechumen's and Communicant's Companion, for the use of young persons of the Lutheran Church, receiving instruction preparatory to confirmation and the Lord's Supper. By John G. Morris, D. D. Pastor of the First English Lutheran Church Baltimore. Third Edition revised and corrected. Baltimore: T. Newton Kurtz, 161 Pratt St.—1854, pp. 268.

THIS volume will be found a most useful companion and valuable help to the Catechumen and Communicant. It abounds in excellent suggestions, and is calculated to awaken a spirit of devotion. The execution of the work is able and judicious, admirably adapted to the object intended, and in every respect worthy of the reputation, which the author enjoys. The best evidence of its excellencies is perhaps afforded in the fact that, during the space of two years, two large editions were exhausted, and a regular demand for the work has ever since been made. It is an important contribution to the literature of our church, and Dr. Morris deserves the gratitude of our Pas-

tors, for the service he has rendered them. We commend with great safety the book to the favorable attention of the church, and with the sanguine expectation, that its introduction among our people will do good.

The Lutheran Almanac for 1855, arranged after the System of German Calendars, with valuable statistical information. Baltimore: T. Newton Kurtz. pp. 34.

We acknowledge our indebtedness to the enterprising publisher, for a copy the Lutheran Almanac for 1855. To the members of our church it will be found to be an exceedingly valuable document. Among its contents are a brief history of the Lutheran Church in the United States, from its earliest settlements to the present time—important information respecting our Literary, Theological and Benevolent institutions—a general statistical view of the Lutheran Church in this country, comprising a complete list of Synods, the time of their organization, number of ministers, number of congregations, etc.—interesting selections from the writings of our own men, and also a general record of the names and address of all Lutheran Ministers in the United States. The clerical register alone, is worth double the price of the Almanac, whilst the numerous statistics will be found most useful for reference. The whole work, we know, has been prepared with much care, and considerable labor. We trust that our people will manifest their appreciation of the publisher's efforts, by endeavoring to give to the Almanac an extensive circulation throughout the church.

Classical Series: Advanced Latin Exercises with selections for reading. American Edition. Revised with additions. Philadelphia: Blanchard and Lea—1854. pp. 162.

This is a continuation of Schmit's and Zumpt's admirable classical series, which we have frequently noticed with favor in the Review. The examination of every successive volume increases our conviction of the excellencies of the series, and of the great service the enterprising publishers are conferring upon classical learning, by the republication of these valuable editions of the Classics. The text is accurate, the notes are judicious, and they are furnished to the student at so cheap a rate, as to diminish very considerably the expense connected with the purchase of the text books required in the prosecution of his studies.

Guido and Julius; or Sin and the Propitiator exhibited in the true consecration of the Sceptic. By Frederick A. D. Tholuck, D. D. Translated from the German, by Jonathan Edwards Ryland, with an introductory preface by John Pye Smith, D. D. Boston: Gould and Lincoln—1854, pp. 238.

This treatise, which was published some thirty years ago in Germany, and passed through five successive editions, was designed to meet some of the subtler and more fascinating forms of scepticism so prevalent in that country. The work performed an important service, and aided in the promotion of a pure and evangelical christianity. The present translation appeared in England in 1836, and was introduced to the public with an interesting prelimina-

ry essay by Dr. Pye Smith. It was supposed that it would prove an antidote to the withering influence of Pantheism, which seemed to be spreading its poison, gaining advocates among the most gifted minds. The publication of the volume in our own land is seasonable. It cannot fail of extensive usefulness, and will greatly tend to afford relief to the desponding, and remove the doubts and fears of many who are bravely struggling to find the true way. In the language of Dr. Smith, we may regard the work as "an important accession to the books of our country, which unite acuteness of investigation with simple and ardent piety."

The Symmetrical Structure of Scripture: or, the Principles of Scripture Parallelism exemplified, in an Analysis of the Decalogue, the Sermon on the Mount, and other passages of the Sacred Writings. By the Rev. John Forbes, LL. D., Donaldson's Hospital, Edinburg. Edinburg: T. T. Clark, 38 George Street. For sale by W. F. Draper, Andover, Mass.

AN able, instructive, and for every genuine student of the Bible, most attractive book.

Unfolding the principles of parallelism as explained by Lowth and Jebb, and advancing in the same direction, great light is thrown by the author on the artificial arrangement of various portions, both limited and extended, of the word of God. At every step new beauties are developed, and materials for increasing admiration of the scriptures furnished. The inspiration of the word of God receives much corroboration from these investigations, and both hermeneutical science and exegesis are materially aided. We think this book deserves, and will command much attention, both in this country and Europe. We may have an opportunity hereafter, of introducing it more fully to our readers.

Cumming's Minor Works. The finger of God. Christ our Pass-over. The Comforter. Philadelphia: Lindsay and Blakistone—1854.

THE admirers of Dr. Cumming, an increasing multitude, will receive this contribution from his pen with emotions of pleasure. Characterized by the same general traits with his other works, it will be read with interest and profit, and cannot fail, as it will be extensively read, to do much good.

The Duty of True Heart Prayer briefly considered, and earnestly enforced. By Rev. John George Butler, Minister of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, Carlisle, Pa., 1784. With an Introductory Essay, by the Translator, Rev. David H. Focht, Evangelical Lutheran minister, Chambersburg, Pa. Printed by M. Kiefer & Co.—1854.

A very scriptural and edifying discourse on a subject of great practical moment. Extensively circulated and read, it must contribute to spiritual good. May the solemn words of this minister of Christ, long since removed from the toils of earth, speak with power to those whose probation is not yet closed!